



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, NOVEMBER 18, 2013

No. 164

## House of Representatives

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BROOKS of Alabama).

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
November 18, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MO BROOKS, to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, November 18, 2013.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
Speaker, U.S. Capitol, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on November 18, 2013 at 10:23 a.m.:

That the Senate agree to the House amendments to the bill S. 252.

With best wishes, I am  
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

### MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DENHAM). Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party

limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 1:50 p.m.

### OBAMACARE MISREPRESENTATIONS AND SOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, on January 15, 2009, in order to get ObamaCare passed, President Obama promised America:

If you like your health care plan, you'll be able to keep your health care plan, period. No one will take it away, no matter what.

On June 28, 2012, in order to get reelection votes, President Obama promised:

If you're one of the more than 250 million Americans who already has health insurance, you will keep your health insurance. This law will only make it more secure and more affordable.

President Obama, in his recent apology for his deceptions, has not stopped the cancelation of millions, millions of Americans' health insurance plans nor slowed the ObamaCare-caused skyrocketing health insurance costs.

ObamaCare forces families to, on the one hand, pay higher ObamaCare health insurance costs and cut spending for food, shelter, and clothing or, on the other hand, go without health insurance and pay tax penalties while risking health-caused bankruptcy.

Montana Democrat Senator MAX BAUCUS, the Senate sponsor of ObamaCare, warned us earlier this year that ObamaCare was a train wreck waiting to happen. Well, the verdict is in. ObamaCare is dysfunctional and threatens the lives and finances of millions of real hardworking Americans.

Mark Templeton of Huntsville, Alabama, writes:

I just received a notice from BlueCross/BlueShield of Alabama yesterday, indicating

my Total Blue plan was no longer available due to the Affordable Care Act. My family coverage increased from \$450 a month to \$1,187 for similar coverage. They were kind enough to offer the more affordable and considerably worse Silver plan for only \$937 per month. I don't qualify for any subsidies, so this will directly hit my household finances. Please make every effort to stop the Affordable Care Act from affecting any more Tennessee Valley families and businesses.

Jessica Moore of Ardmore, Alabama, writes:

I am writing about the not-so Affordable Care Act. My health insurance premiums are going up by 118 percent with BlueCross/BlueShield. The Health Care Marketplace will be of no help to me, as I make "too much" money. I am a single Iraq veteran. I am my sole income. I am perfectly healthy. The amount which my premium was raised is how much money I have left in the bank at the end of the month. I do not live beyond my means. I am a faithful taxpayer. The Affordable Care Act premium hikes are not affordable to me, nor to many other honest taxpayers. Please help the already "taxed to the max" middle class on this issue.

ObamaCare has caused millions of Americans to receive health insurance cancelation letters, leaving them to struggle with how to protect their families. Thanks to ObamaCare, a year from now, tens of millions more Americans risk losing their health insurance once ObamaCare's employer mandate kicks in.

Mr. Speaker, while ObamaCare is dysfunctional and threatens American lives, there is a better way. The American Health Care Reform Act, which I have cosponsored, unleashes the power of free enterprise competition to deliver quality health care at prices Americans can better afford.

Among other things, this bill, first, forces lower health care costs by legalizing interstate competition among insurance companies; second, reforms medical malpractice laws so that health insurance is paying for health care, not frivolous lawsuits; third, lets Americans deduct health care costs

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H7155

and gives Americans a standard deduction for health insurance costs; four, protects Americans with preexisting conditions by bolstering State-based high-risk pools.

Mr. Speaker, health care decisions should be made by doctors and patients, not Washington bureaucrats. Quite frankly, Big Brother bureaucrats have no business butting in and forcing Americans to buy health insurance. Americans cannot afford or do not want.

ObamaCare denies hardworking American taxpayers their right—yes, their right—to choose the health care policy best tailored to their needs. Mr. Speaker, ObamaCare should be repealed, and America should debate health care solutions based on truth, not deception.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOLF) at 2 p.m.

#### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Loving and gracious God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

Help us this day to draw closer to You, so that with Your Spirit, and aware of Your presence among us, we may all face the tasks of this day.

Bless the Members of the people's House. Help them to think clearly, speak confidently, and act courageously in the belief that all noble service is based upon patience, truth, and love.

May they be great enough to be humble and good enough to keep their faith, always regarding public office as a sacred trust. Give them the courage and the wisdom to fail not their fellow citizens nor You.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLAN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. SABLAN led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

#### DELAYING A BROKEN PROMISE ISN'T AN HONEST SOLUTION

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, the panic and frustration felt by millions of American families is real. They all heard the promise:

If you like the health care you have, you can keep it.

And they believed it.

But families in my district are experiencing something different: canceled plans, premium hikes, and uncertainty.

Mark from Advance, North Carolina, tells me:

Both my wife and I are over 60, retired, and self-insured. We received letters notifying us that our health insurance policies are being canceled. The replacement policies cost more than twice as much. If we accept the policies, we will be paying \$798.20 per month for insurance.

Same goes for John from Advance. He writes:

My wife has had her premiums increase from \$200 to \$600. We have had this plan for 6 years and thought we could keep our insurance.

Mark and John were given a promise by President Obama. Telling them to wait 1 year before the promise is broken for good isn't an honest solution.

#### CONGRATULATING PACIFICA INSURANCE UNDERWRITERS ON ITS 40TH ANNIVERSARY

(Mr. SABLAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, 40 years ago, Jose C. Tenorio, a visionary businessman of the Northern Mariana Islands, founded Pacifica Insurance Underwriters.

1973 was an exciting time in our islands. The Covenant was being negotiated. Hotels, tourists, and investors were starting to appear. Yet we were still in our economic infancy. Insurance was hard to obtain. Many did not appreciate the value of insurance. It took commitment and courage for the late Mr. Tenorio and his partners to invest in Pacifica.

Over 40 years, the business flourished, and Pacifica has lived up to the great responsibility of every insurer: when the need arises, they have been there for their customers. Pacifica has also set an example of corporate re-

sponsibility with contributions to worthy causes and with the volunteer activities of its employees throughout our community.

We feel proud to witness a homegrown company do well. So join me in congratulating the owners and employees of Pacifica Insurance Underwriters on their 40th anniversary.

#### WHO SHOULD BE FIRED FOR THIS HEALTH CARE MESS?

(Mr. BURGESS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, last week, I asked the question: What does it take for someone to get fired by this administration? We were faced with the serial incompetence of the rollout of the healthcare.gov Web site. Then, late last week, someone was fired—not for incompetence, but for daring to criticize the administration.

District of Columbia Insurance Commissioner William White criticized the President's rule on allowing people to keep their insurance. The next day, Commissioner White was fired for being public in his criticism of the administration.

If the President is so eager to see people lose their jobs over problems with his health insurance takeover, I have got some suggestions on where he could start.

What about the Director of the Center for Consumer Information and Insurance Oversight? This was the individual who was supposed to oversee the building of the Web site, who in fact misled congressional committees not once, not twice, but three times over the past year.

What about the Chief Information Officer of the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services?

Mr. President, what about the Secretary of Health and Human Services?

Instead of people losing their jobs for simply disagreeing with the President, we should be holding those people responsible whose overwhelming incompetence has caused these problems in the first place.

#### MAKING PROGRESS EVERY DAY

(Mrs. CHRISTENSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, Republicans just can't take "yes" for an answer.

The President addressed the unintended consequences caused more by insurance companies than the Affordable Care Act, a law that has benefited millions of people all across our country in Republican and Democratic districts.

No one is happy about the problems with the Web site, but I have been on some other Web sites recently that have been around a lot longer and run

into glitches that did not allow me to complete an activity either. Jeff Zients and CMS are reporting progress every day; and even though they expect to have it substantially fixed by the end of the month, anyone who knows about technology or wants to be honest about what we are going through will know that the work of improving that Web site will be pretty much a constant process.

Democrats worked to implement laws passed by Republicans that fell short of what we felt was needed. They need to stop all the repeals that they know are going nowhere and focus on jobs, the economy, and legislation that they have let languish that would speed up our sluggish economy. They and their cohorts need to stop urging young people and others not to sign up for health insurance, as is being reported.

The American people need to have the security of access to reliable, affordable health care. The Affordable Care Act begins to give that to us. They want the benefits of the ACA and for us to work together to uphold the laws of the land—not just some, but all of them.

#### AMERICAN PEOPLE DESERVE TO KEEP THEIR HEALTH CARE PLANS

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the President has broken his promises to the American people. Because of the administration's strained interpretation of health care plans under ObamaCare, millions of families continue to receive policy cancellation notifications, destroying jobs.

Last week, the President made another unrealistic promise when he offered to provide a quick fix to this problem. At the same time, he threatened to veto the Keep Your Health Plan Act, bipartisan legislation that passed the House last week that allows him to legislatively follow through with his pledge.

Common sense tells us the President is putting politics over policy when it comes to implementing his signature health care takeover. His administration is out of touch with the struggles American families are experiencing as a result of this destruction and intrusion of our health care system. The best way for American families to experience relief from this law is for the President to work with House Republicans to repeal and replace it with sensible solutions.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

I appreciate the dedicated personnel of the U.S. Naval Hospital of Naples, Italy.

#### NUMBERS TO KNOW

(Mr. HOLT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, thanks to the Affordable Care Act:

Nearly 13 million Americans have benefited from \$1.1 billion in rebates from health insurance companies;

105 million Americans have received access to free preventive services;

Nearly 30 million women are receiving free preventive services;

Up to 17 million children with pre-existing health conditions are no longer denied coverage by insurers;

6.6 million young adults up to age 26 have taken advantage of the law to obtain health insurance through their parents' plans;

More than 100 million Americans no longer have a lifetime limit on their insurance coverage;

More than 7.1 million seniors in the doughnut hole have already saved \$8.3 billion on prescription drugs; and

More than 4.4 million seniors have free annual wellness visits under Medicare.

Mr. Speaker, rather than working to make the Affordable Care Act successful, Republicans are telling Americans they want to return to the days when insurance companies could tell those with preexisting conditions, Sorry, you don't deserve and cannot purchase health insurance.

Forty-six times, Republicans have told Americans that if they reach their lifetime limits, that is just too bad. Forty-six times, they have said they want to keep the Medicare part D doughnut hole and keep medication unaffordable for seniors, and that is the way it is going to be.

Mr. Speaker, Americans deserve access to affordable, quality health care.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 5 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1700

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MESSER) at 5 p.m.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

#### DIGITAL ACCOUNTABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY ACT OF 2013

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2061) to expand the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 to increase accountability and transparency in Federal spending, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2061

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Digital Accountability and Transparency Act of 2013”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

- Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
- Sec. 2. Purposes.
- Sec. 3. Amendments to the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006.
- Sec. 4. Pilot program to evaluate consolidated recipient reporting.
- Sec. 5. Classified and protected information.
- Sec. 6. American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 amendments.
- Sec. 7. Disaster Relief Appropriations Act of 2013 amendments.
- Sec. 8. Executive agency accounting and other financial management reports and plans.
- Sec. 9. Limits and transparency for conference and travel spending.

#### SEC. 2. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are to—

(1) expand the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 by disclosing direct Federal agency expenditures and linking Federal contract, loan, and grant spending information to programs of Federal agencies in order to enable taxpayers and policy makers to track Federal spending more effectively;

(2) provide consistent, reliable, and searchable Government-wide spending data that is displayed accurately for taxpayers and policy makers on USASpending.gov;

(3) analyze Federal spending data to proactively prevent waste, fraud, abuse, and improper payments;

(4) simplify reporting for entities receiving Federal funds by streamlining reporting requirements and reducing compliance costs while improving transparency; and

(5) improve the quality of data submitted to USASpending.gov by holding Federal agencies accountable for the completeness and accuracy of the data submitted.

#### SEC. 3. AMENDMENTS TO THE FEDERAL FUNDING ACCOUNTABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY ACT OF 2006.

Section 2 of the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (31 U.S.C. 6101 note) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking “FULL DISCLOSURE OF ENTITIES RECEIVING FEDERAL FUNDING” and inserting “DISCLOSURE OF FEDERAL FUNDING”;

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (3) and (7), respectively;

(B) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph (2):

“(2) FEDERAL AGENCY.—The term ‘Federal agency’ has the meaning given the term ‘Executive agency’ under section 105 of title 5, United States Code.”;

(C) by inserting after paragraph (3), as redesignated by subparagraph (A), the following new paragraphs:

“(4) **FEDERAL FUNDS.**—The term ‘Federal funds’ means any funds that are made available to or expended by a Federal agency.

“(5) **OBJECT CLASS.**—The term ‘object class’ means the category assigned for purposes of the annual budget of the President submitted under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, to the type of property or services purchased by the Federal Government.

“(6) **PROGRAM ACTIVITY.**—The term ‘program activity’ has the meaning given that term under section 1115(h) of title 31, United States Code.”; and

(D) in paragraph (7), as redesignated by subparagraph (A)—

(i) in subparagraph (B), by striking “paragraph (2)(A)(i)” and inserting “paragraph (3)(A)(i)”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (C), by striking “paragraph (2)(A)(ii)” and inserting “paragraph (3)(A)(ii)”; and

(3) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “the Office of Management and Budget” and inserting “the Secretary of the Treasury” each place it appears;

(ii) in subparagraph (F)—

(i) in clause (i), by redesignating subclauses (I) and (II) as items (aa) and (bb), respectively;

(II) by redesignating clauses (i) and (ii) as subclauses (I) and (II); and

(III) by striking the period at the end of subclause (II) as so redesignated and inserting “; and”;

(iii) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) through (G) as clauses (i) through (vii), respectively, and adjusting the margin accordingly;

(iv) by striking “for each Federal award—” and inserting the following: “for all Federal funds—

“(A) for each Federal agency, component of a Federal agency, appropriations account, program activity, and object class (including any subcomponent of an object class), and other accounts or data as appropriate—

“(i) the amount of budget authority available;

“(ii) the amount obligated;

“(iii) the amount of outlays;

“(iv) the amount of any Federal funds reprogrammed or transferred; and

“(v) the amount of expired and unexpired unobligated balances; and

“(B) for each Federal award—”; and

(v) in subparagraph (B)(iii), as so designated by this subparagraph, by inserting “, which shall be assigned a unique identifier,” after “information on the award”;

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by striking “The Director of the Office of Management and Budget” and inserting “The Secretary of the Treasury”; and

(ii) by striking “the Director” and inserting “the Secretary”;

(C) in paragraph (4)—

(i) by striking “the Director of the Office of Management and Budget” and inserting “the Secretary of the Treasury”; and

(ii) by striking “the Director” and inserting “the Secretary”, each place it appears; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(5) **APPLICATION OF DATA STANDARDS.**—The Secretary of the Treasury shall apply the data standards established under subsection (e) to all data collection, data dissemination, and data publication required under this section.

“(6) **DATA FEED TO RECOVERY ACCOUNTABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY BOARD.**—The Secretary of the Treasury shall provide the data described in paragraph (1) to the Recovery Accountability and Transparency Board so that it can be included in the Recovery Operations Center described in subsection (h).”;

(4) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “and Grants.gov” and inserting “Grants.gov, the Payment Automation Manager and Financial Information Repository and other data or databases from the Department of the Treasury, the MAX Information System of the Office of Management and Budget, and other data from Federal agencies collected and identified by the Office of Management and Budget”;

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by adding “and” at the end; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) specify such search shall be confined to Federal funds.”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting “the Payment Automation Manager and Financial Information Repository and other data or databases from the Department of the Treasury, the MAX Information System of the Office of Management and Budget, other data from Federal agencies collected and identified by the Office of Management and Budget,” after “Grants.gov website.”;

(C) in paragraph (4)—

(i) by striking “shall be updated not later” and inserting the following: “shall be updated—

“(A) not later”; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) not less than once each quarter with information relating to Federal funds.”;

(D) in paragraph (5)—

(i) by inserting “Federal funds and” before “Federal awards” the first place it appears;

(ii) by striking “subsection (a)(2)(A)(i) and those described in subsection (a)(2)(A)(ii)” and inserting “subsection (a)(3)(A)(i) and those described in subsection (a)(3)(A)(ii)”; and

(iii) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(E) by adding at the end the following:

“(6) shall have the ability to aggregate data for the categories described in paragraphs (1) through (5) without double-counting data; and

“(7) shall permit all information published under this section to be downloaded in bulk.”;

(5) by redesignating subsections (e), (f), and (g) as subsections (i), (j), and (k), respectively; and

(6) by inserting after subsection (d) the following new subsections:

“(e) **DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY REQUIREMENTS FOR DATA STANDARDS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, the Administrator of General Services, and the heads of Federal agencies, shall establish Government-wide financial data standards for Federal funds, which shall—

“(A) include common data elements, such as codes, unique award identifiers, and fields, for financial and payment information required to be reported by Federal agencies and entities receiving Federal awards, including identifiers for Federal awards and entities receiving Federal awards;

“(B) to the extent reasonable and practicable, ensure interoperability and incorporate—

“(i) common data elements developed and maintained by an international voluntary consensus standards body, as defined by the Office of Management and Budget, such as the International Organization for Standardization;

“(ii) common data elements developed and maintained by Federal agencies with authority over contracting and financial assistance, such as the Federal Acquisition Regulatory Council; and

“(iii) common data elements developed and maintained by accounting standards organizations; and

“(C) include data reporting standards that—

“(i) incorporate a widely accepted, nonproprietary, searchable, platform-independent computer-readable format;

“(ii) are consistent with and implement applicable accounting principles;

“(iii) are capable of being continually upgraded as necessary;

“(iv) are structured to specifically support the reporting of financial and performance-related data, such as that any data produced, regardless of reporting need or software used for creation or consumption, is consistent and comparable across reporting situations;

“(v) establish, for each data point, a standard method of conveying the reporting period, reporting entity, unit of measure, and other associated attributes; and

“(vi) incorporate nonproprietary standards in effect on the date of enactment of the Digital Accountability and Transparency Act of 2013.

“(2) **DEADLINES.**—

“(A) **GUIDANCE.**—The Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, shall issue guidance on the data standards established under paragraph (1) to Federal agencies not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Digital Accountability and Transparency Act of 2013.

“(B) **WEBSITE.**—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the guidance under clause (i) is issued, the Secretary of the Treasury shall ensure that the website required under this section makes data publicly available in accordance with the data standards established under paragraph (1).

“(C) **AGENCIES.**—Not later than 180 days after the date on which the guidance under subparagraph (A) is issued, each Federal agency shall collect, report, and maintain data in accordance with the data standards established under paragraph (1).

“(3) **CONSULTATION.**—The Secretary of the Treasury shall consult with public and private stakeholders in establishing data standards under this subsection.

“(f) **CONSOLIDATED RECIPIENT FINANCIAL REPORTS.**—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall—

“(1) review the financial reporting required by Federal agencies for Federal award recipients to consolidate financial reporting and reduce duplicative financial reporting and compliance costs for recipients;

“(2) request input from Federal award recipients to reduce duplicative financial reporting, especially from State and local governments and institutions of higher education;

“(3) not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Digital Accountability and Transparency Act of 2013, provide guidance to the heads of Federal agencies regarding how to simplify the reporting requirements for Federal award recipients to consolidate financial reporting, reduce duplicative reporting, and reduce compliance costs, as appropriate; and

“(4) not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of the Digital Accountability and Transparency Act of 2013, submit to Congress a report regarding any legislative action required to consolidate, streamline, or reduce the cost of reporting requirements for Federal award recipients.

“(g) **ACCOUNTABILITY FOR FEDERAL FUNDING.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Digital Accountability and Transparency Act of 2013, and every 2 years thereafter until the

date that is 6 years after such date of enactment, the Inspector General of each Federal agency, in consultation with the Comptroller General of the United States, shall review a sampling of the data submitted under this Act by the agency, and shall submit to Congress and make publicly available a report on the completeness, timeliness, quality, and accuracy of the data sampled and the implementation and use of consistent data standards by the Federal agency.

**“(2) COMPTROLLER GENERAL.—**

**“(A) IN GENERAL.—**Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of the Digital Accountability and Transparency Act of 2013, and every 2 years thereafter until the date that is 6 years after such date of enactment, and after review of the reports submitted under paragraph (1), the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress and make publicly available a report on the completeness, timeliness, quality, and accuracy of the data submitted under this Act by each Federal agency and the implementation and use of consistent data standards by each Federal agency.

**“(B) RANKING.—**The Comptroller General of the United States shall make available a ranking of Federal agencies regarding data quality, accuracy, and compliance with this Act.

**“(h) RECOVERY ACCOUNTABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY BOARD.—**

**“(1) RESOURCES AND MECHANISMS.—**The Recovery Accountability and Transparency Board shall develop and test information technology resources and oversight mechanisms to enhance the transparency of and detect and remediate waste, fraud, and abuse in Federal spending for Inspectors General.

**“(2) WEBSITE.—**The Recovery Accountability and Transparency Board shall maintain a website informing the public of its activities to identify waste, fraud, and abuse and increase transparency of Federal funds to provide support for Inspectors General.

**“(3) RECOVERY OPERATIONS CENTER.—**The Recovery Accountability and Transparency Board shall establish and maintain a Recovery Operations Center as a government-wide Internet-based data access system to carry out the functions described in paragraph (4).

**“(4) FUNCTIONS OF THE RECOVERY OPERATIONS CENTER.—**The functions referred to in paragraph (3) are the following:

**“(A) IN GENERAL.—**The Recovery Operations Center shall incorporate—

**“(i)** all information described in subsection (b)(1);

**“(ii)** other information maintained by Federal, State, local, and foreign government agencies; and

**“(iii)** other commercially and publicly available information.

**“(B) SPECIFIC FUNCTIONS.—**The Recovery Operations Center shall be designed and operated to carry out the following functions:

**“(i)** Combine information described in subsection (b)(1) with other compilations of information, including those listed in subparagraph (A).

**“(ii)** Permit agencies, in accordance with applicable law, to detect and remediate waste, fraud, and abuse.”

**SEC. 4. PILOT PROGRAM TO EVALUATE CONSOLIDATED RECIPIENT REPORTING.**

**(a) IN GENERAL.—**Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Recovery Accountability and Transparency Board, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, shall establish a pilot program relating to reporting by recipients of Federal funds (in this section referred to as the “pilot program”) for the purpose of increasing financial transparency to—

**(1)** display the full cycle of Federal funds;

**(2)** improve the accuracy of Federal financial data; and

**(3)** develop recommendations for reducing reporting required of recipients of Federal funds by consolidating and automating financial reporting requirements across the Federal Government.

**(b) REQUIREMENTS.—**The pilot program shall—

**(1)** include a combination of recipients of Federal contracts, grants, and subawards, the aggregate value of which is not less than \$1,000,000,000;

**(2)** include a diverse group of recipients of Federal awards; and

**(3)** to the extent practicable, include recipients that receive Federal awards from multiple programs across multiple agencies.

**(c) REPORTING AND EVALUATION REQUIREMENTS.—**Each recipient of Federal funds participating in the pilot program shall submit to the Recovery Accountability and Transparency Board reports on the finances of the selected Federal awards.

**(d) PUBLICATION OF INFORMATION.—**All the information collected by the Recovery Accountability and Transparency Board under the pilot program shall be made publicly available and searchable on the website established under section 2 of the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (31 U.S.C. 6101 note).

**(e) TERMINATION.—**The pilot program shall terminate on the date that is 3 years after the date on which the Recovery Accountability and Transparency Board establishes the pilot program.

**(f) REPORT.—**Not later than 90 days after the date on which the pilot program terminates under subsection (e), the Recovery Accountability and Transparency Board shall submit to the Office of Management and Budget, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives a report on the pilot program, which shall include—

**(1)** a description of financial data collected under the pilot program, the accuracy of the data provided, and the cost to collect the data from recipients; and

**(2)** recommendations for—

**(A)** consolidating some or all aspects of Federal financial reporting to reduce the costs to recipients of Federal funds;

**(B)** automating some or all aspects of Federal financial reporting to increase efficiency and reduce the costs to recipients of Federal funds; and

**(C)** improving financial transparency.

**(g) GOVERNMENT-WIDE IMPLEMENTATION.—**Not later than 90 days after the date on which the Office of Management and Budget receives the report required by subsection (f), the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall determine whether to authorize the Recovery Accountability and Transparency Board to extend the recipient reporting requirements of the pilot program to all Federal funds. The Recovery Accountability and Transparency Board shall begin requiring Government-wide recipient reporting at the start of the fiscal year that commences after the fiscal year during which such authorization is granted, and under such terms and conditions that the Board shall determine, in consultation with the Director.

**SEC. 5. CLASSIFIED AND PROTECTED INFORMATION.**

Section 3 of the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (31 U.S.C. 6101 note) is amended to read as follows:

**“SEC. 3. CLASSIFIED AND PROTECTED INFORMATION.**

“Nothing in this Act shall require the disclosure to the public or to any person without an identifiable need to know—

“(1) information protected under section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the ‘Freedom of Information Act’); or

“(2) information protected under section 552a of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the ‘Privacy Act of 1974’), or section 6103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.”

**SEC. 6. AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT OF 2009 AMENDMENTS.**

Division A of Public Law 111-5 is amended—

**(1)** in section 1501 of title XV, by striking paragraph (4) and inserting the following:

**“(4) COVERED FUNDS.—**The term ‘covered funds’—

**“(A)** except as provided in subparagraph (B), means any funds that are expended or obligated from appropriations made under this Act; and

**“(B)** for purposes of sections 1522 and 1524, means funds that are expended or obligated by an agency from appropriations made under this or any other Act.”;

**(2)** in section 1512 of title XV, by adding at the end the following:

**“(i) EXPIRATION.—**The requirements in this section shall expire on December 30, 2013.”;

**(3)** in section 1523 of title XV, by adding at the end the following:

**“(d) EXPIRATION.—**The requirements in this section shall expire on December 30, 2013.”;

**(4)** in section 1526 of title XV, by adding at the end the following:

**“(e) EXPIRATION.—**The requirements in this section shall expire on December 30, 2013.”;

and

**(5)** in section 1530 of title XV, by striking “September 30, 2013.” and inserting “September 30, 2017.”

**SEC. 7. DISASTER RELIEF APPROPRIATIONS ACT OF 2013 AMENDMENTS.**

Division A of Public Law 113-2 is amended in section 904(d)—

**(1)** by striking “for purposes related to the impact of Hurricane Sandy”;

**(2)** by striking “related to the impact of Hurricane Sandy” after “receiving appropriations”; and

**(3)** by striking “related to funds appropriated for the impact of Hurricane Sandy” after “on its activities”.

**SEC. 8. EXECUTIVE AGENCY ACCOUNTING AND OTHER FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT REPORTS AND PLANS.**

Section 3512(a) of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

**(1)** in paragraph (1), by inserting “and make available on the website described under section 1122 of this title” after “appropriate committees of the Congress”;

**(2)** in paragraph (3)(B)(vi), by inserting “, system development, financial management workforce development, related risk assessment and mitigation for the Federal Government as a whole, related risk assessment and mitigation for executive agencies, development of capacity to prevent and detect fraud,” after “equipment acquisitions”; and

**(3)** in paragraph (4), by adding at the end the following:

**“(C)** Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of the Digital Accountability and Transparency Act of 2013, and every 90 days thereafter, the Director shall make available on the website described under section 1122 of this title a report regarding—

**“(i)** specific goals for the most recent full fiscal year, the fiscal year during which the report is submitted, and the fiscal year following the year during which the report is submitted that are necessary steps toward

implementing the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (31 U.S.C. 6101 note) fully and in an effective, efficient, and accurate manner; and

“(ii) the status and progress achieved toward each goal described in clause (i), including any changes to the cost, schedule, or performance baselines of achieving each goal, using earned value management where appropriate.”.

#### SEC. 9. LIMITS AND TRANSPARENCY FOR CONFERENCE AND TRAVEL SPENDING.

(a) AMENDMENT.—Chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 5711 the following:

##### “§5712. Limits and transparency for conference and travel spending

“(a) CONFERENCE TRANSPARENCY AND SPENDING LIMITS.—

“(1) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF CONFERENCE MATERIALS.—Each agency shall post on the public website of that agency detailed information on any presentation made by any employee of that agency at a conference (except to the extent the head of an agency excludes such information for reasons of national security or information described under section 552(b)) including—

“(A) the prepared text of any verbal presentation made; and

“(B) any visual, digital, video, or audio materials presented, including photographs, slides, and audio-visual recordings.

“(2) LIMITS ON AMOUNT EXPENDED ON A CONFERENCE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided under subparagraph (B), an agency may not expend more than \$500,000 to support a single conference.

“(B) EXCEPTION.—The head of an agency may waive the limitation under subparagraph (A) for a specific conference after making a determination that the expenditure is justified as the most cost-effective option to achieve a compelling purpose. The head of an agency shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on any waiver granted under this subparagraph, including the justification for such waiver.

“(C) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to preclude an agency from receiving financial support or other assistance from a private entity to pay or defray the costs of a conference the total cost of which exceeds \$500,000.

“(b) INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE RULE.—An agency may not pay the travel expenses for more than 50 employees of that agency who are stationed in the United States, for any international conference, unless the Secretary of State determines that attendance for such employees is in the national interest, or the head of the agency determines that attendance for such employees is critical to the agency’s mission. The Secretary of State and the head of an agency shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on any waiver granted under this subsection, including the justification for such waiver.

“(c) REPORTING ON TRAVEL AND CONFERENCE EXPENSES REQUIRED.—At the beginning of each quarter of each fiscal year, each agency shall post on the public website of that agency a report on each conference that costs more than \$10,000 for which the agency paid travel expenses during the preceding 3 months that includes—

“(1) the itemized expenses paid by the agency, including travel, lodging, and meal expenses, and any other agency expenditures to otherwise support the conference;

“(2) the primary sponsor of the conference;

“(3) the location of the conference;

“(4) the date of the conference;

“(5) a brief explanation of how the participation of employees from such agency at the

conference advanced the mission of the agency;

“(6) the title of any employee, or any individual who is not a Federal employee, whose travel expenses or other conference expenses were paid by the agency;

“(7) the total number of individuals whose travel expenses or other conference expenses were paid by the agency; and

“(8) in the case of a conference for which that agency was the primary sponsor, a statement that—

“(A) describes the cost to the agency of selecting the specific conference venue;

“(B) describes why the location was selected, including a justification for such selection;

“(C) demonstrates the cost efficiency of the location;

“(D) provides a cost benefit analysis of holding a conference rather than conducting a teleconference; and

“(E) describes any financial support or other assistance from a private entity used to pay or defray the costs of the conference, and for each case where such support or assistance was used, the head of the agency shall include a certification that there is no conflict of interest resulting from such support or assistance.

“(d) FORMAT AND PUBLICATION OF REPORTS.—Each report posted on the public website under subsection (c) shall—

“(1) be in a searchable electronic format; and

“(2) remain on that website for at least 5 years after the date of posting.

“(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) AGENCY.—The term ‘agency’ has the meaning given that term under section 5701, but does not include the government of the District of Columbia.

“(2) CONFERENCE.—The term ‘conference’ means a meeting, retreat, seminar, symposium, or event that—

“(A) is held for consultation, education, discussion, or training; and

“(B) is not held entirely at a Government facility.

“(3) INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE.—The term ‘international conference’ means a conference occurring outside the United States attended by representatives of—

“(A) the Government of the United States; and

“(B) any foreign government, international organization, or foreign nongovernmental organization.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 5711 the following:

“5712. Limits and transparency for conference and travel spending.”.

(c) ANNUAL TRAVEL EXPENSE LIMITS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018, an agency (as defined under section 5712(e) of title 5, United States Code, as added by subsection (a)) may not make, or obligate to make, expenditures for travel expenses, in an aggregate amount greater than 70 percent of the aggregate amount of such expenses for fiscal year 2010.

(2) EXEMPTIONS.—The agency may exclude certain travel expenses from the limitation under paragraph (1) only if the agency head determines that inclusion of such expenses would undermine national security, international diplomacy, health and safety inspections, law enforcement, or site visits required for oversight or investigatory purposes.

(3) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—In each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018, the head of each agency shall submit to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the

House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report containing—

(A) the justification for any expenses excluded (under paragraph (2)) from the limitation under paragraph (1); and

(B) the positive or negative impacts, if any, of the limitation under paragraph (1) on the agency’s mission, cost-effectiveness, efficiency, and ability to perform core functions.

(4) IDENTIFICATION OF TRAVEL EXPENSES.—

(A) RESPONSIBILITIES.—Not later than January 1, 2014, and after consultation with the Administrator of General Services and the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall establish guidelines for the determination of what expenses constitute travel expenses for purposes of this subsection. The guidelines shall identify specific expenses, and classes of expenses, that are to be treated as travel expenses.

(B) EXEMPTION FOR MILITARY TRAVEL.—The guidelines required under subparagraph (A) shall exclude military travel expenses in determining what expenses constitute travel expenses. Military travel expenses shall include travel expenses involving military combat, the training or deployment of uniformed military personnel, and such other travel expenses as determined by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in consultation with the Administrator of General Services and the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, substantially the same bill was passed in the previous Congress. The Digital Accountability and Transparency Act, or the DATA Act, is an important piece of legislation in that it will create the opportunity for government to be more efficient, more effective, and more transparent.

The American people deserve real accountability in how the taxpayer dollars are spent, now more than ever. It is unacceptable for Federal spending on data currently to be so inaccurate, unpredictable, inconsistent, and, quite frankly, expensive.

Nobody can follow the money at the Federal level these days, in spite of the fact that we spend over \$82 billion on IT. Political gain is often had or lost every time a major program funding proves to lead to a dead end. Whether it is a billion-dollar program for the Department of Defense or, now, the

most current challenge, the one faced in healthcare.gov, it is often easy to point fingers.

But, Mr. Speaker, if we are going to handle large data in a way in which we get predictable success rather than inevitable failure, we have to start by demanding that data be structured from the day it is created and formatted in a way that makes it capable of search, aggregating, downloading in bulk, and manipulating, both for the benefit of insiders trying to find accountability and outsiders legitimately exercising their right to know how government is spending their money.

The DATA Act will contain a pilot to examine ways to consolidate and streamline reporting requirements. This will decrease the burden of Federal financial reporting for agencies and for States, school systems, and other recipients of Federal dollars.

We found, during the Recovery Act, that the Recovery Board, using DATA Act-type transparency, was able to find huge amounts of waste, fraud, and abuse and do it in a transparent way in real-time because they required recipient reporting.

Recipient reporting, in a perfect world, would already have taken place; but we recognize that consolidating and improving the way in which data is compiled needs to come first. Therefore, between the pilot in this bill and, in fact, the requirement that we begin structuring data the way the SEC and other agencies have will, in fact, make this legislation a money saver for the Federal Government.

The DATA Act is bipartisan and bicameral and widely supported. A companion legislation was introduced in the Senate by Senator WARNER and Senator PORTMAN. Their legislation is substantially similar and will be easily made into a consolidated bill, one the American people can have confidence in, was thought of over multiple Congresses, well vetted, and, in fact, assure the American people that we will not make, in the next Congress and in Congresses beyond, some of the mistakes that have been made in the past.

With that, I ask for early consideration of this version of the act and would note that we passed out of our committee unanimously, and by voice, not just in our committee, but in the last Congress, a bill substantially similar.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am pleased to rise in support of H.R. 2061, the DATA Act, and I am pleased to work with the chairman as we continue to reconcile this bill with the Senate bill.

The DATA Act will provide the public with information about how the government is spending its money. This will hold agencies accountable for their spending, and it will result in a more effective and efficient government.

The President emphasized the importance of access to data when he issued an executive order on May 9, 2013, that requires government information to be released in ways that make it easy to find and use. The DATA Act would require government spending data to meet those same requirements through data standards issued by the Office of Management and Budget.

The bill also requires that spending data be available through a single Web site.

H.R. 2061 authorizes, in addition, the Recovery Act Board through the year 2017, and requires the Recovery Board to conduct a pilot project involving direct reporting of spending information from recipients of Federal money.

There are a couple of issues that I hope will be resolved as the bill moves forward to the Senate. During the committee markup of this bill, Ranking Member ELIJAH CUMMINGS requested that the bill be amended to address two specific concerns.

One of those concerns was the need to ensure that stakeholders have an opportunity to provide feedback before OMB decides whether to extend the pilot project on recipient reporting.

The other issue was the need to ensure that OMB has the option to extend all the requirements under the pilot project, or just some of the requirements, if the Director determines that is the best course.

Just as the chairman led H.R. 2061 through our committee on a bipartisan basis, I am hopeful that Chairman ISSA will work on the same basis to address these outstanding issues.

This, however, is a good bill, Mr. Speaker; and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR), the leader of the House, and a supporter of big data reform.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California. I want to thank him, as well as the gentlelady from the District of Columbia, for their work on the DATA Act.

Mr. Speaker, I do rise today in support of the Digital Accountability and Transparency Act. The American people deserve a functioning government that is both open and accountable. The DATA Act is an important step to achieving this goal because it will publish Federal spending data and transform it from disconnected documents into open, searchable data for people to see and read through online.

This easily accessible data will create an abundant amount of resources and opportunities for innovation to occur. It will bring about new start-ups and innovators, all of which will be aimed toward turning this data into actionable information.

This information can then be used to help solve some of our Nation's most pressing problems and help all of us better determine where we can better eliminate waste.

Over the last year, Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of visiting a civic start-up called Code for America in California. It is an organization that is committed to helping solve problems, primarily at the local level.

It has a long list of programmers and developers who are ready to take action across the country. They want to use their skills and apply those skills to help government and its citizens be more efficient. But they, first, need to know, when they go into a locality, whether the kind of information they need is going to be accessible.

We can begin to do that today here at the Federal level. With the passage of the DATA Act, we will be one step closer to the American people being able to hold government bureaucracies accountable. Plain and simple, Federal spending data will be easier to access under this bill.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of controversy surrounding the rollout of ObamaCare over the last month. And beyond the core problem of the law's causing the cancellation of individuals' insurance, beyond the core problem of the law's causing the increase in costs to millions of Americans for their health care, one of the more frustrating issues is a lack of transparency on the part of government bureaucracy.

We just cannot tell what the information is right now. How many people have really signed up for ObamaCare?

We don't know whether it is people who have purchased plans on the healthcare.gov site, or whether it is people who have just put them into their shopping carts. Again, very, very frustrating, not only for folks around the country, but for those of us who want to try and help the situation so that government is not cramming down on anyone its prescribed method of health care coverage.

So the DATA Act is an opportunity for both parties to come together and to demonstrate that we are serious about creating a more open and effective government and about holding government accountable. Let's pass this bill so we can begin to restore trust with the American people.

Again, I want to thank the gentleman from California, Chairman DARRELL ISSA, as well as the gentlelady from the District of Columbia, for their work on this bill, the other members of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee for their hard work; and I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume in closing.

I want to thank the gentlelady from the District of Columbia, and particularly note that this has been one of those shining, shining examples of bipartisan behavior by the committee and, I suspect, the entire Congress.

I might note that earlier this month the Senate Homeland Security and



Government Affairs Committee voted unanimously to pass the Senate version of this act, so upon our passage, we will very shortly be in an opportunity to begin making these kinds of changes, and I look forward to that. I look forward to this kind of legislation in the future.

I urge all Members to vote positively on this fundamental reform, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by thanking Chairman ISSA and Ranking Member CUMMINGS for working with the university community to address a number of their concerns with specific provisions of H.R. 2061. I understand that the universities are still seeking some improvements to the legislation in order to ensure a transparent, fair, and effective process for improving the collection of data on federal funding, including of research grants to universities. I hope that the Chairman and Ranking Member will continue to work with the universities as this bill moves forward.

What concerns me most about this legislation is the sudden inclusion of major portions of H.R. 313 in this otherwise unrelated bill. I expressed my concerns about H.R. 313 when it was under consideration earlier this year, and these concerns remain in place today. I think we can all agree that federal agencies need to be wise and judicious in their use of travel funds, and that highly publicized past abuses, while very much the exception, were a wake-up call for us to exercise stricter oversight of taxpayer dollars. The Administration itself, through the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), has also sought to curb these abuses by instituting new travel caps and new reporting requirements on all agency travel and I applaud them for taking this seriously.

However, the scientific community, which includes tens of thousands of federal scientists and engineers at agencies such as the Department of Energy and NASA, depend on face-to-face interaction through conferences and workshops to foster innovation and launch new scientific directions. The scientific community, therefore, is rightfully concerned about the unintended consequences of travel restrictions stifling innovation and stunting economic growth by preventing federal scientists from participating fully in scientific exchanges with their fellow scientists and engineers from across the country and the world.

Once again, I want to thank Chairman ISSA for taking into consideration some of the concerns expressed by the agencies and the scientific community regarding the travel restrictions in H.R. 313 that have now been incorporated into H.R. 2061. However, this legislation still requires significant improvement. While OMB requires all agencies to publicly report on conference expenses in excess of \$100,000, H.R. 2061 would require even more detailed reporting for an agency sending even a single employee to a conference for which the conference's total cost—which may or may not be borne by taxpayer dollars—exceeds \$10,000. In other words, while the intent may have been otherwise, the language as written would not create any reasonable threshold for agency reporting. Are we really going to pay agency staff to post an explanation of how the participation of an employee advanced the mission of the agency for every \$30 roundtrip train ticket to a large meeting or workshop? It

seems to me that in any given fiscal year, the cost of the additional bureaucratic resources necessary to meet this requirement will exceed the actual expenses incurred.

I also remain concerned about what I see as arbitrary limits on the number of agency employees who may participate in large, international, scientific conferences and on the total amount an agency may spend not just next year, but through fiscal year 2018. I hope that, if this bill should continue to move forward, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will work with our colleagues in the other body to continue to perfect this bill. As the Ranking Member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, I stand by to assist in whatever way I can to ensure that we do not implement new regulations with unintended negative consequences for the progress of U.S. health, science, and innovation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2061, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□ 1715

#### CLARIFICATION OF DETERMINATION OF COMPENSATION OF CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3343) to amend the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to clarify the rules regarding the determination of the compensation of the Chief Financial Officer of the District of Columbia.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3343

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. CLARIFICATION OF DETERMINATION OF COMPENSATION OF CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

(a) DETERMINATION OF COMPENSATION.—Section 424(b)(2)(E) of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act (sec. 1-204.24(b)(2)(E), D.C. Official Code) is amended to read as follows:

“(E) PAY.—The Chief Financial Officer shall be paid at a rate such that the total amount of compensation paid during any calendar year does not exceed an amount equal to the limit on total pay which is applicable during the year under section 5307 of title 5, United States Code, to an employee described in section 5307(d) of such title.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to pay periods beginning on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from

California (Mr. ISSA) and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, a capable chief financial officer is paramount to the physical health and integrity and defensiveness of any organization that he or she oversees. The District of Columbia is no exception. Just the opposite. The Federal city is perhaps the most important place for people to look at a microcosm of whether or not the Federal Government can be fiscally responsible.

In the 1990s, when the District of Columbia was bankrupt, Congress, at its discretion and the direction of this committee, stepped in with sweeping legislation to help the city's sinking financial ship. Included in these reforms was the establishment of an independent chief financial officer to oversee the city's finances. Since the creation of this position, Congress has come to rely upon the D.C. CFO to give an objective, unvarnished picture of the city's finances. The D.C. CFO is our best window into the financial status of the Federal city.

The bill before us today spends no Federal dollars. It simply allows the District to use its own locally generated funds to pay its CFO as much as a member of the Federal Government's Senior Executive Service can receive in total compensation. Now, I know that the men and women here on the floor understand the Senior Executive Service. But for those who may not, we have, throughout the government, hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of positions that are very senior that make, in fact, at times more than Members of Congress. These are specialists. These are highly trained career professionals that, in fact, make up to but not more than the Vice President.

Back in the 1990s when we created this position, we established an amount that seemed reasonable at the time. Today, establishing a more flexible amount, one that can change over time as the Senior Executive Service changes, makes more sense. Ultimately, there are CFOs throughout government—some of them controlling less responsibility and smaller amounts of funds and certainly, in many cases, less significant and complex relationships than that of a city of over 500,000 with countless different departments, including, obviously, the



education of children, the security of the Federal city, and the like. For that reason, it seems only fitting that we link it to a salary that can be at least as great as a senior Federal service.

Now, ultimately, we are not mandating a salary. We are only allowing the city to recruit someone who is created by an act of Congress to serve this body as a window into our oversight of the Federal city. This legislation was supported unanimously by the Oversight and Government Reform Committee last month, and I urge all Members to support this important technical change to the charter for the city of the District of Columbia.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I associate myself with the remarks of the chairman.

I rise in support of this important legislation, with special appreciation to Majority Leader ERIC CANTOR and particularly to Chairman ISSA and Ranking Member CUMMINGS for quickly marking up this bill so that it could come to the floor expeditiously, as the District is in the throes of hiring a new CFO. I will have more to say on their indispensable support presently.

The District of Columbia's independent chief financial officer is a unique office in the United States created by Congress. The city cannot obligate or expend funds without the CFO's approval, and the CFO can only be terminated for cause.

Today's bill, which contains a formula developed by Chairman ISSA, is an important example of the chairman's continuing commitment to assist the city in improving and safeguarding its vital operations.

When the current CFO announced his retirement earlier this year, the Mayor formed a CFO search committee, led by Alice Rivlin, the former head of the D.C. Financial Control Board, the Office of Management and Budget, and the Congressional Budget Office, and former Mayor Anthony Williams.

The search committee determined that the allowable compensation that is in the bill is necessary for the recruitment and retention of a CFO, but the District government does not have the authority under the Home Rule Act to alter the CFO's compensation. This bill would amend the Home Rule Act to permit the D.C. government to pay its CFO an amount that may not exceed the pay of members of the Senior Executive Service in agencies with an Office of Personnel Management-certified appraisal system.

Currently, the Home Rule Act sets the CFO's pay at the basic pay for level I of the executive schedule. The bill's compensation standard, as with the term of an interim CFO under the D.C. Chief Financial Officer Vacancy Act, which we got enacted earlier this year, was established by Chairman ISSA and is supported by the city. I am particularly grateful to the chairman and also to Majority Leader CANTOR for their continued partnership on legislation to

improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the District of Columbia government.

As with today's bill, their assistance was indispensable last month as the Congress, with bipartisan help from the Senate, agreed for the first time to remove the threat of a D.C. government shutdown by permitting the city to spend its local funds, its own locally raised taxpayer funds, for the entire fiscal year 2014.

While Federal agencies' spending authority expires on January 15, the CR that Congress approved matches the city's responsibility to raise local funds with its right to, therefore, spend these funds, consistent with budget autonomy for the District, which Majority Leader CANTOR, Chairman ISSA, and Ranking Member CUMMINGS have all supported.

Again, I want to offer not only my own but also the gratitude of the city. The District has chosen a CFO; but, unfortunately, that matter is still pending because it has to lay over here in the Congress. The city is faced with the issue of two sovereigns that must approve a piece of legislation. Whenever I have had anything approaching that kind of emergency, the chairman has gone out of his way to see to it that we proceeded and that the city was not inconvenienced or, dare I say, embarrassed. I very much appreciate the way in which he expedited this bill and got it on a markup—and there have not been a lot of markups—but he made sure this got on the most recent markup. I particularly appreciate his innovation in devising a formula that would, in fact, be approved as I believe and hope it will today by this House.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ISSA. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In closing, to my colleague from the District of Columbia, Eleanor, thank you. Thank you for the work you do for the District. It is our committee's jurisdiction to oversee the Federal city, and it is an honor; but it wouldn't be possible if not for the engagement of Delegate NORTON, if it wasn't for the cooperation we have had with the Mayor and members of the council and with the outgoing CFO.

So we don't often get an opportunity on the House floor to talk about, candidly, the fact that we are hosted by a city here. We have jurisdiction over it; but, ultimately, the day-to-day operation is not a burden to Congress but, rather, a benefit to Congress that we have by having this unique relationship.

So as I urge all Members to vote for this important change, I want to thank the majority leader and all those who have brought this bill in a timely fashion to the floor so that we could make a decision and go to hiring a new CFO so we would never be without a person to oversee the finances and to report to Congress in a timely fashion so that we

can have confidence that the people who so kindly host us, in fact, will remain fiscally responsible and solvent throughout anything that may come their way.

So, again, to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), I thank her. Mr. Speaker, I thank you for this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3343.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EXTENSION AND EXPANSION OF ADMINISTRATIVE PENALTY AUTHORITY OF FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION THROUGH 2018

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3487) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act to extend through 2018 the authority of the Federal Election Commission to impose civil money penalties on the basis of a schedule of penalties established and published by the Commission, to expand such authority to certain other violations, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3487

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF ADMINISTRATIVE PENALTY AUTHORITY OF FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION THROUGH 2018.

Section 309(a)(4)(C)(iv) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 437g(a)(4)(C)(iv)) is amended by striking "December 31, 2013" and inserting "December 31, 2018".

#### SEC. 2. EXPANSION OF ADMINISTRATIVE PENALTY AUTHORITY OF FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION.

(a) APPLICATION TO QUALIFIED DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS.—Section 309(a)(4)(C)(i) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 437g(a)(4)(C)(i)) is amended by striking "any requirement of section 304(a) of the Act (2 U.S.C. 434(a))" and inserting "a qualified disclosure requirement".

(b) SCHEDULE OF PENALTIES FOR EACH VIOLATION.—Section 309(a)(4)(C)(i)(II) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 437g(a)(4)(C)(i)(II)) is amended by inserting "for violations of each qualified disclosure requirement," before "under a schedule of penalties".

(c) DEFINITION OF QUALIFIED DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENT.—Section 309(a)(4)(C) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 437g(a)(4)(C)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating clause (iv), as amended by section 1, as clause (v); and

(2) by inserting after clause (iii) the following new clause:

"(iv) In this subparagraph, the term 'qualified disclosure requirement' means any requirement of—

“(I) subsections (a), (c), (e), (f), (g), or (i) of section 304; or  
“(II) section 305.”.

### SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the earlier of—

- (1) December 31, 2013; or
- (2) the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) and the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 3487, reauthorizing the Federal Election Commission's Administrative Fines Program. This program, which was established in the year 2000, provides the FEC with a consistent, transparent process for determining and administering fines for campaign finance reporting violations primarily related to late or incomplete filings with the Commission. It also provides filers with an inexpensive and efficient alternative to full investigations and enforcement proceedings to resolve very minor filing violations.

Using a public formula that takes multiple factors into consideration, like length of delay and repeat offenses, the FEC's program simply assesses the appropriate fines associated with a minor violation.

For example, if a Political Action Committee or Federal candidate files their quarterly expenditures 24 hours past the submission deadline, the Administrative Fines Program will automatically determine the financial penalty using its formula and then send a notification. If there is no dispute, the fine is just simply paid.

H.R. 3487 also expands this successful program to include reports filed by other types of organizations if the FEC's commissioners adopt a formula of fines for them. This effective program saves the agency, filers, and taxpayers money. However, without this bill, the program will expire on December 31 of this year.

With that, I certainly want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRADY) as well as the other members of our committee, the House Administration Committee, for their support of this bill. And I would urge my colleagues to support this reauthorization.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3487, a bill to reauthorize the Federal Election Commission's Administrative Fines Program through 2018.

□ 1730

This program allows the FEC to streamline “straightforward disclosure violations” and enact a penalty. Since its introduction in 1999, the AFP has improved the enforcement process, decreased late filings, and assessed over \$4 million in fines. Reauthorizing the AFP program is a reasonable and appropriate step.

The FEC is a small agency charged with the monumental task of overseeing the massive, complex, and eroding campaign funding system. In the wake of Citizens United, we need them more than ever. Instead, the agency has been mired in partisan games, distracting it from important functions such as conducting audits or issuing regulations, advisory opinions, and enforcement actions. But now, with a new, confirmed full slate of commissioners, I look forward to the agency moving ahead and returning to its core duties instead of the partisan squabble of the past.

Even though my Republican colleagues and I don't always see eye-to-eye on these campaign finance issues, we all agree that the AFP program has been successful. I am very proud to stand with Chairman MILLER on this issue.

I urge all Members to support H.R. 3487. I urge an “aye” vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would just close by saying that, as a former secretary of state from the great State of Michigan and a former chief elections officer of my State, I think this is a very common-sense, cost-efficient, cost-effective program. It has worked very, very well for the agency, for the FEC, and certainly for filers as well as taxpayers.

I would urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3487 and reauthorize the Federal Election Commission's Administrative Fine Program.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3487.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

### AUTHORIZING USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL FOR CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL CEREMONY FOR NATIVE AMERICAN CODE TALKERS

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 25) authorizing the

use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for activities associated with the ceremony to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Native American code talkers.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

S. CON. RES. 25

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),*

### SECTION 1. USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL FOR GOLD MEDAL CEREMONY FOR NATIVE AMERICAN CODE TALKERS.

Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center is authorized to be used on November 20, 2013, for a ceremony to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Native American code talkers. Physical preparations for the conduct of the ceremony shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as may be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) and the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in very strong support of Senate Concurrent Resolution 25, authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall on Wednesday, November 20, for a ceremony to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Native American code talkers who assisted the United States military and our ally powers. This ceremony, Mr. Speaker, is a very long overdue recognition of all Native American code talkers that served this Nation during times of foreign conflict.

Although the contributions of the Navajo code talkers during the World Wars have been the most celebrated, many, many other Native American tribes deserve recognition for their courage and dedication to this Nation as well. Thousands of Native Americans from over a dozen tribes across the country saw the threats to humanity being posed and joined with our military forces to protect our common homeland. It was a call to action that they selflessly and successfully accomplished.

I want to thank our former colleague from Oklahoma, Mr. Boren, for his leadership on H.R. 4544, the Native American Code Talkers Act, which provides for this overdue recognition and celebration.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support this resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I join the chair in supporting S. Con. Res. 25, which authorizes the use of Emancipation Hall for a ceremony to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Native American code talkers. I am very pleased to support the efforts to honor these patriotic Americans and their service to our Nation during some of its most trying times. This honor is extremely well deserved, and I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it is my great honor to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), a member of the Rules Committee and also recently named last week as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Legislative Branch Appropriations. Also, Mr. COLE is a member of the Chickasaw Nation and the Chickasaw Hall of Fame.

Mr. COLE. I thank my friend, the chairman, for yielding me the time and for her gracious remarks.

Mr. Speaker, Native Americans have fought against, with, and for the United States more than any other group of people in the history of our country, and it is still true today. Native Americans enlist in the American military at a higher rate than any other race or ethnicity in the United States. That sense of protecting one's place and one's land, which is such an integral part of Native American history, is deep and alive and has benefited this country.

As my friend the chairman mentioned, most Americans are certainly aware of the distinguished role of the Navajo code talkers in the Second World War. What many of them are not aware of, though, is how many others served not only in that war, but as far back as the First World War.

This ceremony will recognize 33 tribes whose members are considered DOD code talkers. Ten of those tribes are from my home State of Oklahoma, and three of them—the Choctaws, Comanches, and Kiowas—reside in my district. It is a privilege for me, as a Native American, to support this resolution and urge its adoption.

It is right that we recognize the contribution of these Americans—the first Americans—who were so often discriminated against at the time in which they contributed to the defense of our country and, in some cases in the First World War, still did not have the rights of other American citizens. Most Native Americans did not actually achieve the right to vote until 1924. So the fact that they were willing to go and lay their life on the line to assist this country, I think, speaks volumes about their patriotism and their commitment.

So I thank my friends for bringing the resolution to the floor. I look forward to voting in support of it, and I urge its adoption by the House.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it is my great privilege to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN), a member of the Transportation and Infrastructure and Natural Resources Committees. He is also a citizen of the Cherokee Nation.

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentlelady from Michigan for yielding me time to speak on such an important issue.

The Cherokee Nation has a rich history of pride and heritage inside this country. At a very young age, I had the special privilege of meeting a gentleman, another former member of the Cherokee Nation, Wayne Russell.

Wayne Russell was taken care of by my grandparents. My grandad, Kenneth Morris, is also a Cherokee member, who fought in the European theatre as a combat engineer. Wayne Russell was a neighbor of my granddad.

My grandmother and granddad took care of Wayne until he passed away. At a young age, I got the privilege of getting to know him. We share the same birthday, and so it was a common bond for us. Wayne used to tell me stories of how he got to use his native language to help this great Nation win a war against a group of individuals that had very bad intentions not just in our country, but in this world.

Wayne never asked for anything. Wayne simply stood up each day and did his job when he was in uniform. When he came home, he didn't ask for anybody to give him anything. He didn't ask for a handout. He was just proud to serve.

Before I even knew what code talkers were, Wayne used to tell me about it all the time, because he used to teach the Cherokee language in the school I went to in Westfield. So Wayne would talk to me in our native tongue and tell me about the stories that he had from the war.

He didn't realize he was special. I didn't really realize he was special. But today, I get to stand up and talk about him. What an honor it is for me to stand on this House floor as a Member of the United States Congress and get to bring Wayne Russell's name up and tell people what he did.

Wayne has passed. When he left, he left me all his medals. And we get to stand up this week and vote on something to honor not just Cherokee members, but the members of Native Americans in Indian Country all across this great Nation that didn't ask for anything, but just simply did their job. They didn't realize they were special; they just did what it took to win. Because we have pride in Indian Country. We take great pride in this great country we call America. And for us to stand up and speak up for them, what an opportunity for this House to reach across the aisle and show bipartisan support to honor a group of people.

So it is an honor to stand up here, Mr. Speaker, and it is an honor that the gentlelady from Michigan has

given me time to talk about Wayne Russell and something important to me.

I urge my colleagues to support this. Let's stand together and say "thank you" to a group of people that is well overdue.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I must say, I hope that all of us are looking forward to this ceremony because I think it is going to be a very impressive one and give us a chance to honor, again, these wonderful, patriotic Americans.

I urge an "aye" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I don't know how I follow on from the two previous speakers we had on our side that talked very eloquently from their heart about their pride in their heritage and their pride as being Americans and now as Members of the Congress about this bipartisan bill, and it is a ceremony that I tell my colleague from California we are all looking forward to.

As I mentioned in my opening remarks, it is certainly a ceremony that is long overdue for the recognition of all Native Americans, and particularly these code talkers and what they did to keep America free. They are great ambassadors of liberty, freedom, and democracy.

I urge all my colleagues to support Senate Concurrent Resolution 25, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 25.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL WILLIAM H. GOURLEY FEDERAL OUTPATIENT CLINIC: A JOINT VA-DOD HEALTH CARE FACILITY

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 272) to designate the Department of Veterans Affairs and Department of Defense joint outpatient clinic to be constructed in Marina, California, as the "General William H. Gourley Federal Outpatient Clinic: A Joint VA-DOD Health Care Facility", as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 272

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. NAME OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE JOINT OUTPATIENT CLINIC, MARINA, CALIFORNIA.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The Department of Veterans Affairs and Department of Defense joint outpatient clinic to be constructed at

the intersection of the proposed Ninth Street and the proposed First Avenue in Marina, California, shall be known and designated as the "Major General William H. Gourley VA-DOD Outpatient Clinic".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, regulation, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States to the Department of Veterans Affairs and Department of Defense joint outpatient clinic referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Major General William H. Gourley VA-DOD Outpatient Clinic".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP) and the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 272, which designates the Department of Veterans Affairs and Department of Defense joint outpatient clinic to be constructed in Marina, California, as the General William H. Gourley VA-DOD Outpatient Clinic.

I want to commend Representative SAM FARR of California for sponsoring this legislation.

□ 1745

Mr. Speaker, the late Major General William H. Gourley gave this Nation 36 years of committed and distinguished service in the United States Army. That service took him to far off places such as Vietnam, Korea, Turkey, and Germany, where he had an immediate and positive impact on the soldiers and officers with whom he served.

When General Gourley's service to the Nation was done, he returned to his beloved Monterey, California, to retire. He became actively involved in the Monterey community, helping to oversee the restructuring of Fort Ord for civilian reuse following the Base Realignment and Closure decision to shut down that Army post.

Mr. Speaker, General Gourley was also instrumental in paving the way for the joint VA-DOD outpatient clinic to be constructed in Marina, California, which is why it is fitting that that clinic, which when completed will serve our Active Duty and retired military, their families and veterans, be named the General William H. Gourley VA-DOD Outpatient Clinic.

General Gourley dedicated his life to serving the military. The VA-DOD clinic will stand as a reminder of his service to all those who will benefit from the health care provided by the clinic in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Major General William Gourley was truly a soldier's soldier. His long and storied career can be summed up by the motto he took with him across the Army to every unit he commanded: "Soldiers first." He insisted that support of the military must focus on the needs of soldiers, and this mantra soon became the standard across the entire Army personnel community.

After more than 30 years in uniform, General Gourley continued fighting for the well-being of soldiers and their families. His bigger-than-life persona and caring nature endeared him to Active Duty soldiers and veterans alike, and he could often be seen at the former Fort Ord—at the commissary or at the PX—inquiring as to how service-members were and as to how he could help them. He was a fixture at the local VA clinic, but dreamed of a larger facility that could seamlessly integrate care over the life of a soldier.

It was this desire, coupled with his penchant for helping others, which led him to play an instrumental role in the planning and development of the soon-to-be joint VA-DOD hospital. It would only be fitting to see this new and innovative facility named after a true American hero.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I have no further requests for time. I am prepared to close after my colleague has yielded back her time.

I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my colleague from California (Mr. FARR), the sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. FARR. Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you, Congresswoman DAVIS, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of, obviously, the legislation I have authored, but I really appreciate the statements that have been made here about General Gourley. He was a very special human being—tall-statured, an incredible soldier, and a retiree who kind of brought together the retiree community of the military along the entire Monterey Peninsula.

We still have nine military missions, including the Naval Postgraduate School, the Defense Language Institute, at which all the languages of the world are taught, the Manpower Development Center, Fort Hunter Liggett, Camp Roberts, and so on. So we have a lot of military there.

He recognized that not only did the Active Duty soldiers—men and women in uniform who have a clinic at the Defense Language Institute—have to live off of TRICARE but, really, so did their spouses and children. A lot of the doc-

tors in the community wouldn't accept TRICARE because the reimbursement rates were so low. So here were underserved populations. There was a widow population of military retirees, who, after the base closed and the hospital closed and where there was space available, they weren't really familiar with how to use TRICARE or how to find TRICARE doctors. There was the Active Duty military, and then there was this incredible veterans community. So, for the first time in the history of this country, we got the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Department of Defense together, and we decided that they ought to plan a clinic.

General Gourley was so instrumental in getting that sort of one-stop, proud-to-serve opportunity to be in the design of a building and in the operation of a building, and it was no small task because all of these agencies want to be joined. I always remind people that you can't be a veteran without having walked through the Department of Defense first. In the old days, when you left the Department of Defense, then you had to find your way. You had to find your papers and get them all transferred and do all of this heavy lifting, and there was always bureaucracy and a loss of papers and a loss of stuff. So this one-stop system, which we all think is much more cost-effective and a proud way to say "thank you" to those who serve, is really going to be implemented in this brand new clinic on which we just broke ground on Veterans Day, a week ago.

From my seat on the Military Construction Appropriations Subcommittee, I have learned that we really need to find this unity. When we had found it, it had always been advocated by General Gourley. Unfortunately, he passed away a couple of years ago, but just before he passed away, I was able to do an oral interview with him to archive in the Library of Congress because Congress has developed this oral history archive. I would urge all of my colleagues in Congress to take part in doing these interviews with veterans and to archive their experiences.

General Gourley served in many, many places in this country. He was always a leader and was outspoken. He was critical of things that needed to be criticized. When he was head of the War College in Carlisle, Pennsylvania, he insisted that soldiers couldn't go to class unless they brought their wives, so that those spouses would come to understand that the Army mindset, in the form of a greater bond within the family, is a shared duty and a shared sacrifice. In that sense of unity, he always used to say, "Leave a better Army." Leave it better than you found it.

I think he left this world a lot better than he found it. One way the community would like to pay tribute to him for his using his retirement to continue to bring this collaboration and this "thinking outside the box" together is to name this new clinic after him. He

□ 1830

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 2061, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 272, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The second electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

## DIGITAL ACCOUNTABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2061) to expand the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 to increase accountability and transparency in Federal spending, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 388, nays 1, not voting 41, as follows:

[Roll No. 588]

YEAS—388

Aderholt  
Amash  
Amodei  
Andrews  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Barber  
Barletta  
Barr  
Barrow (GA)  
Barton  
Bass  
Beatty  
Becerra  
Benishek  
Bera (CA)  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Blumenauer  
Bonamici  
Boustany  
Brady (PA)  
Brady (TX)  
Braley (IA)  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Broun (GA)  
Brownley (CA)  
Buchanan  
Burgess  
Bustos

Butterfield  
Calvert  
Camp  
Cantor  
Capito  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardenas  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Cartwright  
Cassidy  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Chu  
Cicilline  
Clarke  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Coffman  
Cohen  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Cook  
Cooper  
Costa  
Cotton  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Crowley

Cuellar  
Cummings  
Daines  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
Davis, Rodney  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Denham  
Dent  
DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Deutch  
Diaz-Balart  
Doggett  
Doyle  
Duckworth  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Ellmers  
Enyart  
Eshoo  
Esty  
Farenthold  
Farr  
Fattah  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Fleming

Flores  
Fortenberry  
Foster  
Fox  
Frankel (FL)  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Garcia  
Gardner  
Garrett  
Gerlach  
Gibbs  
Gibson  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (MO)  
Grayson  
Green, Gene  
Griffin (AR)  
Griffith (VA)  
Grimm  
Guthrie  
Hahn  
Hall  
Hanabusa  
Hanna  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Heck (NV)  
Heck (WA)  
Hensarling  
Higgins  
Himes  
Hinojosa  
Holding  
Honda  
Horsford  
Hoyer  
Hudson  
Huelskamp  
Huffman  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurt  
Israel  
Issa  
Jackson Lee  
Jeffries  
Jenkins  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Jordan  
Joyce  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kelly (PA)  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kirkpatrick  
Kline  
Kuster  
Labrador  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Langevin  
Lankford  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Latham  
Latta  
Levin  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loebsock

Lofgren  
Long  
Lowenthal  
Lowe  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lujan Grisham (NM)  
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)  
Lummis  
Lynch  
Maffei  
Maloney  
Carolyn  
Maloney, Sean  
Marino  
Massie  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHenry  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Meeks  
Meng  
Messer  
Mica  
Michaud  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller, Gary  
Miller, George  
Mullin  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (FL)  
Murphy (PA)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Negrete McLeod  
Neugebauer  
Noem  
Nolan  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Nunnelee  
O'Rourke  
Olson  
Owens  
Palazzo  
Pallone  
Pascarell  
Pastor (AZ)  
Paulsen  
Payne  
Pearce  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Perry  
Peters (MI)  
Peterson  
Petri  
Pingree (ME)  
Pittenger  
Pitts  
Pocan  
Poe (TX)  
Polis  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price (GA)  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rice (SC)  
Rigell  
Roby  
Roe (TN)

Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Ruiz  
Runyan  
Ruppersberger  
Ryan (OH)  
Ryan (WI)  
Salmon  
Sánchez, Linda T.  
Sanford  
Sarbanes  
Scalise  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schrader  
Schweikert  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, Austin  
Scott, David  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sessions  
Sewell (AL)  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Southerland  
Speier  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Stockman  
Stutzman  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Terry  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tierney  
Tipton  
Titus  
Tonko  
Tsongas  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Van Hollen  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walorski  
Walz  
Waxman  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Welch  
Wenstrup  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Williams  
Wilson (FL)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Wolf  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yarmuth  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IN)

would be so proud. I was at his burial at Arlington National Cemetery in 2008. In honor of his lifetime of service to our country, to our troops, to our veterans, I am really proud to have introduced this bill, which is to name the clinic after this American hero. I am proud to have been his friend, and I ask your support in passing the bill.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, we have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, health care is a morale staple of our military, both in Active Duty and when we become veterans, whether it is in theatre or at home, as those who have served or who are serving know that, on the health care side, we have their backs. General Gourley understood that.

I urge all to vote in favor of this bill in order to give him the recognition that is due.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 272, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

## COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, November 18, 2013.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
The Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on November 18, 2013 at 4:21 p.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 3204.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

## RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

NAYS—1

Holt

## NOT VOTING—41

Bentivolio	Gosar	Richmond
Brown (FL)	Green, Al	Rogers (AL)
Bucshon	Grijalva	Rokita
Campbell	Gutiérrez	Rooney
Carter	Herrera Beutler	Rush
Coble	Kingston	Sanchez, Loretta
Conaway	Lee (CA)	Schock
Courtney	Lewis	Schwartz
Crenshaw	Marchant	Shimkus
Culberson	McCarthy (NY)	Thompson (MS)
Dingell	Moore	Wasserman
Engel	Moran	Schultz
Forbes	Peters (CA)	Waters
Gingrey (GA)	Radel	Watt

□ 1857

Mr. STIVERS, Ms. CHU, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. CLARKE, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

# GENERAL WILLIAM H. GOURLEY FEDERAL OUTPATIENT CLINIC: A JOINT VA-DOD HEALTH CARE FACILITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 272) to designate the Department of Veterans Affairs and Department of Defense joint outpatient clinic to be constructed in Marina, California, as the “General William H. Gourley Federal Outpatient Clinic: A Joint VA-DOD Health Care Facility”, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 388, nays 0, not voting 42, as follows:

[Roll No. 589]

YEAS—388

Aderholt	Brady (PA)	Chabot
Amash	Brady (TX)	Chaffetz
Amodei	Braley (IA)	Chu
Andrews	Bridenstine	Cicilline
Bachmann	Brooks (AL)	Clarke
Bachus	Brooks (IN)	Clay
Barber	Broun (GA)	Cleaver
Barletta	Brownley (CA)	Clyburn
Barr	Buchanan	Coffman
Barrow (GA)	Burgess	Cohen
Barton	Bustos	Cole
Bass	Butterfield	Collins (GA)
Beatty	Calvert	Collins (NY)
Becerra	Camp	Connolly
Benishek	Cantor	Conyers
Bera (CA)	Capito	Cook
Bilirakis	Capps	Cooper
Bishop (GA)	Capuano	Costa
Bishop (NY)	Cárdenas	Cotton
Bishop (UT)	Carney	Courtney
Black	Carson (IN)	Cramer
Blackburn	Cartwright	Crawford
Blumenauer	Cassidy	Crowley
Bonamici	Castor (FL)	Cuellar
Boustany	Castro (TX)	Cummings

Daines	Jordan	Perlmutter	Walorski	Westmoreland	Womack
Davis (CA)	Joyce	Perry	Walz	Whitfield	Woodall
Davis, Danny	Kaptur	Peters (MI)	Waxman	Williams	Yarmuth
Davis, Rodney	Keating	Peterson	Weber (TX)	Wilson (FL)	Yoder
DeFazio	Kelly (IL)	Petri	Webster (FL)	Wilson (SC)	Yoho
DeGette	Kelly (PA)	Pingree (ME)	Welch	Wittman	Young (AK)
Delaney	Kennedy	Pittenger	Wenstrup	Wolf	Young (IN)
DeLauro	Kildee				
DelBene	Kilmer				
Denham	Kind	Poe (TX)			
Dent	King (IA)	Polis			
DeSantis	King (NY)	Pompeo			
DesJarlais	Kinzinger (IL)	Posey			
Deutch	Kirkpatrick	Price (GA)			
Diaz-Balart	Kline	Price (NC)			
Doggett	Kuster	Quigley			
Doyle	Labrador	Rahall			
Duckworth	LaMalfa	Rangel			
Duffy	Lamborn	Reed			
Duncan (SC)	Lance	Reichert			
Duncan (TN)	Langevin	Renacci			
Edwards	Lankford	Ribble			
Ellison	Larsen (WA)	Rice (SC)			
Ellmers	Larson (CT)	Rigell			
Enyart	Latham	Roby			
Eshoo	Latta	Roe (TN)			
Esty	Levin	Rogers (KY)			
Farenthold	Lipinski	Rogers (MI)			
Farr	LoBiondo	Rohrabacher			
Fattah	Loebuck	Ros-Lehtinen			
Fincher	Lofgren	Roskam			
Fitzpatrick	Long	Ross			
Fleischmann	Lowenthal	Rothfus			
Fleming	Lowe	Roybal-Allard			
Flores	Lucas	Royce			
Fortenberry	Luetkemeyer	Ruiz			
Foster	Lujan Grisham	Runyan			
Fox	(NM)	Ruppersberger			
Frankel (FL)	Luján, Ben Ray	Ryan (OH)			
Franks (AZ)	(NM)	Ryan (WI)			
Frelinghuysen	Lummis	Salmon			
Fudge	Lynch	Sánchez, Linda			
Gabbard	Maffei	T.			
Gallego	Maloney,	Sanford			
Garamendi	Carolyn	Sarbanes			
Garcia	Maloney, Sean	Scalise			
Gardner	Marino	Schakowsky			
Garrett	Massie	Schiff			
Gerlach	Matheson	Schneider			
Gibbs	Matsui	Schrader			
Gibson	McCarthy (CA)	Schweikert			
Goodlatte	McCauley	Scott (VA)			
Gowdy	McClintock	Scott, Austin			
Granger	McCollum	Scott, David			
Graves (GA)	McDermott	Sensenbrenner			
Graves (MO)	McGovern	Serrano			
Grayson	McHenry	Sessions			
Green, Gene	McIntyre	Sewell (AL)			
Griffin (AR)	McKeon	Shea-Porter			
Griffith (VA)	McKinley	Sherman			
Grimm	McMorris	Shuster			
Guthrie	Rodgers	Simpson			
Hahn	McNerney	Sinema			
Hall	Meadows	Sires			
Hanabusa	Meehan	Slaughter			
Hanna	Meeks	Smith (MO)			
Harper	Meng	Smith (NJ)			
Harris	Messer	Smith (TX)			
Hartzler	Mica	Smith (WA)			
Hastings (FL)	Michaud	Southerland			
Hastings (WA)	Miller (FL)	Speier			
Heck (NV)	Miller (MI)	Stivers			
Heck (WA)	Miller, Gary	Stockman			
Hensarling	Miller, George	Stutzman			
Higgins	Mullin	Swalwell (CA)			
Himes	Mulvaney	Takano			
Hinojosa	Murphy (FL)	Terry			
Holding	Murphy (PA)	Thompson (CA)			
Holt	Nadler	Thompson (PA)			
Honda	Napolitano	Thornberry			
Horsford	Neal	Tiberi			
Hoyer	Negrete McLeod	Tierney			
Hudson	Neugebauer	Tipton			
Huelskamp	Noem	Titus			
Huffman	Nolan	Tonko			
Huizenga (MI)	Nugent	Tsongas			
Hultgren	Nunes	Turner			
Hunter	Nunnelee	Upton			
Hurt	O'Rourke	Valadao			
Israel	Olson	Van Hollen			
Issa	Owens	Vargas			
Jackson Lee	Palazzo	Veasey			
Jeffries	Pallone	Vela			
Jenkins	Pascrell	Velázquez			
Johnson (GA)	Pastor (AZ)	Visclosky			
Johnson (OH)	Paulsen	Wagner			
Johnson, E. B.	Payne	Walberg			
Johnson, Sam	Pearce	Walden			
Jones	Pelosi				

## NOT VOTING—42

Bentivolio	Green, Al	Rokita
Brown (FL)	Grijalva	Rooney
Bucshon	Gutiérrez	Rush
Campbell	Herrera Beutler	Sanchez, Loretta
Carter	Kingston	Schock
Coble	Lee (CA)	Schwartz
Conaway	Lewis	Shimkus
Crenshaw	Marchant	Stewart
Culberson	McCarthy (NY)	Thompson (MS)
Dingell	Moore	Wasserman
Engel	Moran	Schultz
Forbes	Peters (CA)	Waters
Gingrey (GA)	Radel	Watt
Gohmert	Richmond	
Gosar	Rogers (AL)	

□ 1904

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: “A bill to designate the Department of Veterans Affairs and Department of Defense joint outpatient clinic to be constructed in Marina, California, as the ‘Major General William H. Gourley VA-DOD Outpatient Clinic’”.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today, I missed the following votes:

H.R. 2061—Digital Accountability and Transparency (DATA) Act of 2013. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes” on this bill.

H.R. 272—To designate the Department of Veterans Affairs and Department of Defense joint outpatient clinic to be constructed in Marina, California, as the “General William H. Gourley Federal Outpatient Clinic: A Joint VA-DOD Health Care Facility. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes” on this bill.

# REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1965, FEDERAL LANDS JOBS AND ENERGY SECURITY ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2728, PROTECTING STATES' RIGHTS TO PROMOTE AMERICAN ENERGY SECURITY ACT

Mr. BISHOP of Utah, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-271) on the resolution (H. Res. 419) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1965) to streamline and ensure onshore energy permitting, provide for onshore leasing certainty, and give certainty to oil shale development for American energy security, economic development, and job creation, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2728) to recognize States' authority to regulate oil and gas operations and promote American energy security, development, and job creation, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.



## OBAMACARE

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address what has really been going on behind the scenes in the Affordable Care Act. You see, if millions of people didn't lose their coverage, the architects of the law knew the exchanges would be full just of sick and elderly, without healthier populations subsidizing those plans.

No matter which way you spin it, the President's broken promises—this one, in particular—should concern us all. We were promised we could keep our policies, coverage, and doctors; yet these choices are now being denied for millions of Americans.

Many of us are not surprised. For the fact of the matter is that the Affordable Care Act is not about consumer choice. It is about governmental control, control over our lives, control over our decisionmaking. This is social engineering at its worst.

The lackluster performance of a Web site will disappear over time. Unfortunately, the insurance cancellations and cost increases are going to continue regardless of an executive order or another "promise" from the White House. The American people deserve better, Mr. Speaker; and they surely can't afford more broken promises.

#### TRIBUTE TO GERARDO I. HERNANDEZ OF PORTER RANCH, CALIFORNIA

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, today there was a memorial in Washington in honor of a great public servant, Gerardo I. Hernandez, the first transportation security officer to be killed in the line of duty. It is with great sorrow that I offer my deepest sympathy to his family and pay tribute to him. He died on Friday, November 1, 2013, in Los Angeles of gunshot wounds received from an assailant while he was doing his duty as a transportation security officer. He was the first one to be killed in the line of duty.

He was born in El Salvador and became an American citizen. He met Ana, the love of his life, who he married in 1998, and they have two wonderful children.

In 2010, he joined the Transportation Security Administration. Everyone indicated what a great public servant he was. He was always excited to go to work and enjoyed the interaction with the passengers at LAX. He was a joyful person, always smiling, took pride in his duty for the American public and for the TSA mission.

As a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee, I offer my deepest sympathy and ask for a 1-minute ac-

knowledge of this great and fine public servant. May he rest in peace.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great sorrow but also great admiration that I rise to pay tribute to Gerardo I. Hernandez of Porter Ranch, California.

Mr. Hernandez died on Friday, November 1, 2013, in Los Angeles of gunshot wounds received from an assailant while he was doing his duty as a Transportation Security Officer at the Los Angeles International Airport.

He was the first TSA officer killed in the line of duty in the 12 year history of the agency. He was only 39 years old.

Gerardo Hernandez was born in El Salvador in 1973 and at the age of 15 immigrated to the United States to escape the civil unrest of that war-torn country in 1988.

Four years later, Gerardo met Ana, the love of his life, whom he married in 1998. Together, Gerardo and Ana were the loving parents of two wonderful children, Louis and Stephanie.

Mr. Speaker, in 2010, Gerardo Hernandez joined the Transportation Security Administration, an agency created from the ash and rubble and heartbreak of the terrorist attack of September 11. He did so because he loved his adopted country and wanted to do what he could to help keep her safe. According to his wife Ana:

[Gerardo] was always excited to go to work and enjoyed the interactions with the passengers at LAX. He was a joyful person, always smiling. He took pride in his duty for the American public and for the TSA mission.

Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee and former chair of its Transportation Security Subcommittee, I can tell you that Gerardo Hernandez was a good man and reflected TSA at its best.

He will be greatly missed by his family and friends and colleagues and by countless members of the flying public who will remember how he also greeted them with a smile and treated them with respect.

Gerardo Hernandez was a special person but happily for our country he is not unique.

Every day thousands of TSA employees carry out their mission of keeping the airways safe for the flying public. The importance of TSA in safeguarding transportation throughout the nation cannot be understated.

On average, TSA officers screen 1.7 million air passengers at more than 450 airports across the nation, which in 2012 amounted to 637,582,122 passengers.

TSA provides security for the nation's airports, maintains a security force to screen all commercial airline passengers and baggage, and works with the transportation, law enforcement and intelligence communities to ensure the security of the air transit industry.

Mr. Speaker, sometimes we tend to forget just how horrible was that September 11 day twelve years ago. That day changed forever the way we gain access to commercial airplanes.

From that day on Americans understood that a little temporary inconvenience in exchange for the more permanent security of a safe and uneventful flight was a small price to pay.

It is people like Gerardo Hernandez who do their best to make the necessary screening as unintrusive and unburdensome as possible

consistent with the mission of ensuring the security of all members of the flying public.

And they are willing to risk their lives to ensure the job gets done.

We owe the men and women of the TSA a debt of gratitude. They have earned our respect and appreciation and our support. Their hearts ache over the loss of their friend and colleague.

But they recognize and understand that the best way to honor the memory of the great Gerardo Hernandez is to continue doing what he always did: treat everyone with respect, greet them with a smile, and discharge their duties so that all passengers screened board their flights secure in the knowledge that every precaution has been taken to ensure that they reach their destination and return safely home to the families and friends who know them best and love them most.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House to observe a moment of silence in honor of Gerardo I. Castillo, the first Transportation Security Officer to lose his life in the line of duty.

#### ARE THE PEOPLE THE ENEMY OF THE STATE?

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, from Bubba in southeast Texas to the Pope, no one is off limits to the surveillance of the National Spy Agency, NSA. Americans are fighting the Soviet-style surveillance by filing thousands of open records requests on the NSA. Citizens want to know if the "snoop and spy" agency has monitored their emails, phones, computers, and location devices. Rather than transparency, the citizens have received just a form letter with no answer to their questions, all because it is a spy secret. Citizen Joel writes, "I should have the right to know if I am under surveillance."

Courts should put a stop to the NSA Soviet-style surveillance and grant injunctions and open records requests. The NSA is addicted to spying and snooping. It has no authority under the PATRIOT Act nor the Constitution to impose domestic dragnet surveillance on citizens. This is a clear violation of the Fourth Amendment.

NSA acts like the people are the enemy of the state. However, this NSA activity is the enemy of personal privacy in the United States.

And that's just the way it is.

#### SAFE CLIMATE CAUCUS

(Mr. TONKO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, in the past week, we have seen yet another devastating storm claim the lives and communities of thousands of people in the Philippines as well as a string of tornadoes that cut through 12 States, from New York to Tennessee. These powerful storms last for a matter of days, while recovery from their destruction takes years.

Hurricane Irene began as a tropical storm on August 20, 2011. By the time it completed its path on August 29, it had wreaked havoc from Puerto Rico to New England, becoming the seventh most costly hurricane in our Nation's history, while taking 56 lives. The storm lasted a mere 10 days, no more than 36 hours in any one spot; but in my district and other affected areas, people are still recovering more than 2 years later. Infrastructure still needs to be repaired or replaced or improved upon. Businesses have not fully recovered, and many families are still struggling to rebuild their homes and their lives.

The costs continue to mount. We have denied our responsibility to deal with climate change for far too long. The time to act is now.

□ 1915

#### PROTECTING AMERICAN INNOVATION AND JOBS

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong concern about the increasingly discriminatory trade and investment environment in India.

The United States and India share a very important trade and security relationship. But our trading relationship is being threatened by an alarming array of discriminatory and internationally inconsistent actions and decisions recently. This is particularly the case in the area of intellectual property.

Intellectual property is the engine that drives the U.S. economy. The attacks on our IP not only harm U.S. job creation and competitiveness, but also chip away at the overall global IP framework that is essential to the innovation of new medicines. Since 2012, India has inappropriately revoked or denied patents on at least 14 lifesaving and life-enhancing drugs. These decisions harm the R&D system, hurting patients and their families who rely on the development of new cures and treatments.

That is why earlier this year Representative JOHN LARSON and myself were joined by 170 other Members of this body in urging the administration to raise these issues at the highest level of discussions with the Indian government. It is critical that we send a strong message to our trading partners that we will not sit idly by while India blatantly undermines intellectual property rights and discriminates against our businesses.

#### FIGHTING FOR THE MIDDLE CLASS

(Mr. PERRY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I was visited today in my district office by an individual who is one of my constituents—and one of my bosses—who told me about his disappointment with me and our government here in Washington and our inability to positively affect his life.

He told me a story about how he and his wife lost their health care policy. What is worse, he told me about his diagnosis of cancer, which has wracked his body and is spreading throughout his organs. He told me how he felt Washington didn't care at all about him and how he had been lied to. He wanted someone to fight for him and the other people in the middle class.

I just wanted to come to the floor today, Mr. Speaker, and echo that account so that he knows that someone is here fighting for him. I dedicate myself to fighting on his behalf and for the other millions of Americans just like him.

#### A PROMISE MADE IS A PROMISE KEPT

(Mr. COLLINS of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, where I come from in northeast Georgia, a promise made is a promise kept.

This is my constituent, Theresa, from Commerce, Georgia. She wasn't initially opposed to ObamaCare. For 12 years, Theresa has been paying on a plan that provides no deductible and reasonable copays. As a 54-year-old on a fixed income, this plan has worked well for her. A few weeks ago, she found out that her plan will be terminated at the end of this month. Alternative coverage will cost her at least \$5,000 more a year and will not provide as many benefits as her current plan. Theresa says many of her family and friends will have their health insurance premiums double, thanks to an unaffordable Affordable Care Act.

House Republicans don't just talk about giving Americans the opportunity to keep their insurance coverage if they want to, but we have wanted that all along. We are listening to the American people, even if the President won't.

#### CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS: HUNGER IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CRAMER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HORSFORD) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

##### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials into the

RECORD on the subject of this Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, this evening, we come to this Special Order to bring attention to the issue of hunger in America.

In just a little more than over a week, many of us will spend time around our tables celebrating Thanksgiving dinner. And as we give thanks for the incredible benefits that we enjoy, there are many Americans who will go without. They will go without a nutritious meal. They will go without meals in the classrooms or after school. Many of our veterans will go without meals as well.

And so tonight, the Congressional Black Caucus uses its hour in this Special Order to bring attention to these important issues, particularly at this time in the debate about our budget.

Earlier this month, on November 1, the 2009 Recovery Act's temporary increase in funding for the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP, expired, resulting in an additional benefit cut to all households. According to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, this is approximately a \$25-per-month or \$300-a-year cut to nutritional benefit programs for a family of four. SNAP benefits will now average less than \$1.40 per person per meal in 2014, down from \$1.50 previously.

Bringing attention to these issues is critical, particularly, as I said, when we are entering negotiation on the farm bill as well as negotiation on the budget. So tonight you will hear from members of the Congressional Black Caucus who see these issues as priorities in these negotiations.

I would like to extend time now to the chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, a lady who serves on the Agriculture Committee and who has been a champion for the issues of SNAP as well as other food assistance programs in the farm bill. I yield to the gentlelady from Ohio, Representative FUDGE.

Ms. FUDGE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to thank my colleagues, Congressmen HORSFORD and JEFFRIES, for continuing to lead the Special Order and for tonight leading on a Special Order hour that addresses another important topic, and that is hunger in America.

In 10 days, Americans will come together with family and friends to celebrate Thanksgiving, but for many families around the country, their Thanksgiving tables will be sparse and some even bear. As one of the wealthiest countries in the world, it is shameful that this Nation has not and will not address the issue of hunger.

As ranking member on the House Agriculture Subcommittee that oversees our country's nutrition programs, I am working hard to end hunger in America.

One in every six Americans struggle with hunger or food insecurity. This is an issue that plagues nearly every community, from our inner cities to our rural countryside. While Americans are still struggling to rebound from the recent recession, many families have already seen a setback as they experience a reduction in SNAP, which my colleague talked to you about just a moment ago. The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities reports that this reduction is equal to the loss of 16 meals for a family of three.

When children are hungry, they are not able to focus in school. When seniors have limited resources and limited incomes, they are forced to make the difficult choice between purchasing medicine and sufficient groceries.

Mr. Speaker, when the House adjourns this Thursday, many of us will go home to spend the Thanksgiving holidays with our families. Some will serve the less fortunate in our communities. But let's all take the time to talk to workers at food banks and other charities, ask about the impact of Federal benefits cuts, the increased demand on charitable antihunger programs and what has been done to fill the gap. Just a short discussion with those who have fallen on hard times can be a sobering reminder of the impact a little help can provide.

And to the American people who are struggling this Thanksgiving, please know that the CBC has not forgotten you. As the conscience of the Congress, we continue to fight for you every single day. The fight is far from over, but as long as one American is suffering, we will fight on.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HORSFORD. Thank you to the chair of the Congressional Black Caucus. As she said, we will fight on. These are issues that are not going to go away.

With the farm bill negotiations, I am optimistic that, despite the fact that when that bill was brought here to the House of Representatives in October and there was an incomprehensible \$40 billion cut to SNAP, we can bridge that gap between now and the end of the year and pass a farm bill that includes the important policy for farm subsidies in this country that are necessary, but do so by not including special subsidies for Big Agriculture and other corporations while cutting \$40 billion in SNAP food assistance to the poor.

Again, these are issues that are critically important to American families across this great country. They are issues that we are hearing about daily from our constituents.

Many people don't realize that it is not only good for the individual who is on food assistance, but it is also good for our economy because this is money that goes back into our local grocery stores that keeps people employed and helps our local economy. So it is a benefit in two ways.

I would now like to turn attention to the gentleman from Indiana, Rep-

resentative CARSON from the Seventh Congressional District, for his remarks during this Special Order.

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Thank you to my dear colleague from Nevada, Congressman HORSFORD, also to my colleague from Brooklyn, Representative JEFFRIES, and also Chairwoman MARCIA FUDGE of the CBC.

Mr. Speaker, a special ed teacher contacted my office last month, worried about cuts to food stamps and the impact that they would have on her classroom. One of her sixth grade students had burst into tears in the middle of her lesson because she heard on the news that benefits would be cut on November 1.

Mr. Speaker, this teacher was compassionate enough to take the child's concerns quite seriously. She gave them a voice by contacting our office. I rise today, Mr. Speaker, to be this child's voice—and the voice of all of those who live in the wealthiest Nation on Earth but still live in hunger.

Mr. Speaker, if you look at the list of the most food insecure districts in the country, you see populations of every race and every ethnicity. Even in the State with the least food insecurity, 15 percent of families still struggle to find their next meal. So while I speak today as a member of the esteemed Congressional Black Caucus, we stand with all Americans.

Sadly, my congressional district in the great Hoosier State of Indiana holds the dubious distinction of having one of the highest rates of food insecurity in the entire country. Over 30 percent of families in Indiana struggle to put food on the table and don't always know where their next meal is coming from.

To be clear, this is not a criticism of the local food banks or not-for-profits that serve the poor very honorably. Hoosiers take care of one another, which is why we have some of the best service organizations in the entire country. But sadly, even the best food banks can't pull food out of thin air.

Over the past few years, Mr. Speaker, I have heard from many Indiana food banks that donations are down as more people struggle to make ends meet in our economic downturn. With high unemployment and underemployment, Federal assistance simply isn't buying enough food to meet their demand. The shelves just aren't as full as they used to be. This leaves many low-income constituents to rely on SNAP, also known as food stamps, a program that will be cut by \$5 billion next year as recovery provisions expire.

Even with ideal funding levels, food stamps never means large, multicourse meals for poor families. The average person receives less than \$1.50 per meal.

□ 1930

For many of these families, Mr. Speaker, a healthful meal is already a luxury that remains out of reach. These families just want to put food on

the table. The program means a few hundred dollars a month per family, which is enough for some bread, cereal, and canned food, but rarely is it enough for fresh vegetables or meat. No one gets rich off of food stamps, but at least they can eat. Yet, for some reason, the program remains one of the prime targets of the Members of Congress who are now fighting to cut nearly 4 million people from this program. This is unacceptable, and it has real-life implications.

Fortunately, in our district, the Seventh Congressional District of Indiana, we have the Indy Hunger Network, the Butler University's Center for Urban Ecology, the Indiana Healthy Weight Initiative, Indiana's Family and Social Services Administration, FSSA, and the Indy Food Council. They are working with our local farmers' markets to encourage people who are receiving assistance to reinvest in our local economy by matching the SNAP dollars spent on fresh fruits and vegetables. These types of partnerships are not supported when we decide to cut benefits and eligibility. We must invest in these types of creative initiatives, programs that feed our communities and incentivize healthy living, programs that create jobs and rebuild our economy so that people are fed and healthy enough to go to school, to work and to contribute to our economy.

Some of my colleagues argue that our debt is out of control, that we need to rein in spending, and that every American should be asked to sacrifice equally, but we have to put this thing into perspective. If you are a person who makes millions of dollars every year, you might lose hundreds of thousands of dollars, maybe. If you own a business, you might decide to invest a little less. By contrast, if you make a minimum wage and live under the poverty line year after year, what might you lose? Monetarily, very little—\$50 here, \$100 there. There would be a small impact on our debt, but that small amount—those few dollars here and there—equates to food on the table.

When looking for so-called "equitable treatment," no one is ever asking a wealthy person to go hungry, but that is exactly what some of my Republican colleagues are doing with their proposal to cut \$39 billion to SNAP. They are suggesting that some Americans, like those in poor neighborhoods in Indianapolis, simply don't deserve to eat because it is too expensive. Other Republicans argue that SNAP is only meant as a temporary stopgap.

For most people, Mr. Speaker, poverty isn't a temporary stop on the way to prosperity. If a family is fortunate enough to pull itself out of poverty, it could take many years, maybe even a decade. Unfortunately, our recession pushed many families in the wrong direction, costing jobs, incomes, and homes. It also moved people deeper into poverty. This means more children will go to school on empty stomachs. It means more aging seniors already on

fixed incomes are forced to choose between buying groceries and medication. It means more poverty, not less. In fact, between 2007 and 2012, during the height of the Great Recession, the number of food stamp users rose 77 percent because more people needed them.

I am standing here with my brilliant and esteemed colleagues, Representative HORSFORD and Representative JEFFRIES and the Congressional Black Caucus, because our districts are some of the hardest hit, but this isn't a Black issue, Mr. Speaker. This is a nationwide problem that impacts every color and ethnicity in every city, county, and town. Yet some of our colleagues in this House are willing to ignore millions of their constituents—those who are struggling to eat—just to pass a bill to cut SNAP by \$39 billion. We should be increasing SNAP funding, not decreasing it. We should learn the lessons of European austerity measures. We should be debating an extension of expiring provisions to avoid benefit reductions next year. We should be focused on ending hunger in America, not just on cutting programs that might reduce the debt.

Mr. Speaker, as I close, many of us take for granted that we can grab a sandwich or make a salad when we need to eat. Most people here—I know I will—will celebrate Thanksgiving next week and will have tables full of good food, some of the best food that money can buy. Yet, for many in America, Thanksgiving is just another day spent in hunger. For these people, a traditional Thanksgiving meal is simply out of reach. Yet we believe that struggling families across the country would say that, on Thanksgiving, they are thankful for any amount of food they can buy—the food that SNAP helps them buy.

Instead of taking this away, let's fight for a higher quality of life, and let's stand together to make sure our neighbors, our children, and our vulnerable seniors never go hungry.

Mr. HORSFORD. I would like to thank the distinguished gentleman from Indiana for his remarks and for highlighting the fact that this is an issue that affects all American families across this country. We all know someone who relies on SNAP benefits or we have come into contact with individuals—our neighbors, our friends, our veterans—who rely on these benefits as well. To somehow suggest that this is an issue that only a certain number of communities should care about is simply false, and it is why we are having this conversation, Mr. Speaker. This is a conversation that we have on each and every Monday that we have the opportunity to come to the floor of the House in order to raise important issues like the one we are raising tonight on hunger.

I want to encourage people who are listening right now to send us your comments and to share your experiences with SNAP benefits. You can do so by sending us a tweet at #cbctalks,

and we will try to share your comments and your questions so that we can have this conversation here on the floor of the House, because it is a conversation that many families across America are confronting.

I would like to invite up my esteemed colleague from New York, with whom I have the honor of co-anchoring the CBC Special Order hour. It has been a great opportunity to get to know him and to work with him on these important issues. I would like to start a bit of a conversation with him, if I can, on these issues. There are a number of things I would like to touch on with the gentleman from New York.

The first is on which households are most affected by this food insecurity across America. Will you touch upon that? Then I would like to talk about how the attack on SNAP also plays into the Affordable Care Act.

I yield now to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES).

Mr. JEFFRIES. Congressman HORSFORD, thank you very much for yielding, and thank you very much for the tremendous leadership that you have shown on this issue and for anchoring the CBC Special Order, this hour of power during which, for 60 minutes, members of the Congressional Black Caucus consistently, every Monday that we are in session, have the opportunity to take to the floor of the House of Representatives and to speak directly to the American people about an issue of great significance affecting their quality of life. Today, we are tackling an extremely important issue in a country that is the wealthiest Nation in the world. It is the issue of hunger.

For the life of me, I haven't been able to figure out why in this country, with all of this wealth—I come from the city of New York, where Wall Street is the engine that drives the world's economy. Yet, in neighborhoods that are in the shadows of Wall Street, you have children and seniors who are going to bed hungry and who are waking up the next day without any hope as to how they will be able to satisfy their nutritional needs.

Across this country, it appears that there are approximately 50 million people who are food insecure—50 million Americans who go to bed hungry at night. Approximately 16 million of those Americans are children born into very difficult circumstances not of their doing. They are not hungry by choice. They are hungry based on the urgency of their situations. It seems that, in this great Nation, we should be doing everything possible to deal with that food insecurity.

Now, as it relates to Americans and to those who are most impacted by food insecurity and hunger, approximately 1 in 10 Caucasian households is food insecure; one in seven overall households in America is food insecure; and approximately one in four African American households—25 percent of the people in the African American com-

munity—goes to bed hungry. Not a single person, whether he is Black or White, Asian or Latino, old or young, should be food insecure in the greatest Nation in the world.

The reality of the situation is that, as opposed to making progress on this issue in America, we stand here today on the floor of the House of Representatives and are at the risk of going backwards because there are some in this Chamber on the other side of the aisle who, for some reason, think that it makes sense to balance the budget on the backs of children and seniors and of those who are hungry in America. There is no other way, Representative HORSFORD, to explain the fact that, in this Chamber, you had people voting for a \$39 billion cut to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, colloquially known as “food stamps”—a \$39 billion cut.

Now, the explanation that is often given to us is that this is a fiscally responsible approach to the reality that, from a financial standpoint, we are on an unsustainable path in America. Certainly, as a member of the Budget Committee, I am of the view that there are some challenges that we have to confront in moving forward, particularly as they relate to the growth of the older American population and to the fact that people in America are living longer. Those two realities are going to create a strain on health care costs in America, and it is something that we are going to have to confront in moving forward. When you hear doom and gloom statements made about the deficit and the debt in America, it is important to unpack those statements and to really and truly evaluate what has driven the explosion of the debt in America.

It certainly hasn't been the fact that there are hungry people in this country whom we are trying to help. That is not driving the debt explosion in America. It is a failed war in Iraq while in search of weapons of mass destruction, weapons that to this day have not and will never be found because they didn't exist; a mis-prosecuted war in Afghanistan that has carried on much longer than it needed to because we were off on a diversion in Iraq; the Bush tax cuts that were passed in 2001 and in 2003, which helped to explode the deficit, that were unpaid for and that benefited disproportionately the wealthy and the well off in America.

These are the reasons we are in the debt and deficit situation that we confront in this country today. It is not because we have got 50 million Americans who are food insecure whom we are trying to help in the greatest Nation in the world.

Now, I am thankful for organizations like the Food Bank For New York City, back at home, which provides assistance to those who are trying to make it on a day-to-day basis with food banks all across the city, including many in the district that I represent.

□ 1945

But there is a role for government to play in providing assistance to needy Americans. These aren't individuals who have chosen poverty as a lifestyle. They have not chosen hunger as a lifestyle. These are individuals who find themselves in a difficult spot, and we as a government should be doing everything we can to help them turn their lives around.

In 2008, the economy collapsed. It was the worst situation financially that we found ourselves in since the Great Depression. Since that moment, the recovery that we have experienced, as I have talked about from time to time on the floor of the House of Representatives, has been a very schizophrenia one. It has been an uneven one. It has been a recovery that has benefited some in America while others have been left behind.

Earlier today, the stock market crossed over to the 16,000 point mark for the first time, I believe, in our Nation's great history. The stock market is way up, CEO compensation is way up, corporate profits are way up, the productivity of the American worker is way up. Yet unemployment remains stubbornly high and consumer demand is stagnant and working families and middle class folks are struggling. Income inequality has reached levels in some places in this country not seen since the Great Depression; and, as we have discussed, far too many Americans are hungry.

It seems that in the midst of this uneven, schizophrenia, economic recovery, where the corporate titans are doing well and those with robust stock portfolios are doing extremely well, and CEOs and companies are doing extremely well, that we can find the compassion in this House and in the Congress and in our great government to make sure that in America, the richest Nation in the world, we can embrace the principle that no child, no senior, no individual should go to bed hungry; and that we can't rest until every single American has been able to benefit from the turnaround that began to take place under this administration, but that still has a ways to go in order for all Americans to be included in getting up off the ground, moving forward, and putting them in a place where they can pursue life and liberty and happiness consistent with that principle included in that grand document of our Founding Fathers.

Let me close by making an observation. Earlier this week, or a few days ago over the weekend, I had an opportunity to attend a farmers market in the east New York portion of the district. At this farmers market, there was a whole host of healthy food options that were being sold, many of which were grown in the community garden that was immediately adjacent to this farmers market. It was a wonderful sight to see seniors and young people and others who were out with the opportunity to purchase healthy

food options—fruits and vegetables—at an affordable price. It was an example for me of what can be done on a community level to help tackle this issue.

I resolved myself that as I came back down to the Congress, I would commit to doing all that I can to replicate that effort for the people in the Eighth Congressional District back home, for the people in Nevada, for the people all across this country to deal with the hunger issue, but also to make sure that healthy food options are made more available, because we recognize that the consequence, not just of hunger, but of poor diet, bears a direct relationship to the fact that many in urban America and in other parts of the country are disproportionately suffering from a wide range of ailments—respiratory disease, heart disease, childhood obesity—that directly relate to poor nutrition.

That is one of the reasons why we on this side of the aisle have remained committed to the Affordable Care Act as something that is good for America. All of these issues that we work on here in this country ultimately tie toward trying to do things that are good for America—for children, for seniors, for working families, and for the middle class.

That is why I am proud to stand with my colleague, Representative HORSFORD, as well as the members of the Congressional Black Caucus, in tackling the issue of food insecurity, tackling the issue of the Affordable Care Act, and continuing to work on behalf of the betterment of America.

Mr. HORSFORD. Thank you to the gentleman from New York, the co-anchor for this Special Order hour, Representative JEFFRIES. I look forward to a dialogue on this, but let me just underscore what it is we are faced with in this House of Representatives.

Our colleagues on the other side, the House Republicans, proposed \$40 billion in food assistance cuts to low-income families over 10 years. This would affect 210,000 children who currently receive free school meals and would affect some 170,000 veterans—yes, veterans—who also depend on SNAP benefits in our country, and would cost an estimated 55,000 job cuts in just the first year of cuts alone.

At a time when we should be growing the economy, adding jobs, helping our veterans, helping the poor, and those who are striving to be part of the middle class, the bill that was passed in October has these devastating cuts to children, to seniors and, yes, even to our veterans.

Now, I have said before, and I will say it again, we should not be cutting the safety net for our most vulnerable while maintaining costly government subsidies for the well-off industries. That is what my colleague from New York just talked about. Littered in this farm bill are subsidies for Big Ag, some of which they themselves didn't even ask for and they know should be expiring in order for us to preserve

funding for children, seniors, and veterans.

So it is not a Nevada child in my district who receives just over \$4 a day to eat who is the problem with the Federal budget deficit. The problem is corporate welfare and the special interest giveaways that litter our Tax Code. It is time that we put a face to the individuals who are benefiting from these programs. That is what we are here to spotlight tonight.

I would like to share just three quick stories of constituents who have shared with me in my office their impact and reliance on the food assistance program, known as SNAP.

The first is Alma. She lives on Social Security in my district. She currently receives \$932 a month. Out of that she pays all of her bills—her rent, her utilities, she gets all of her necessities, and has very little left over. She has about \$91 a month that she can live off for food. Now, with these proposed cuts, it would be \$54 based on a history of cuts and adjustments. She doesn't want to be on SNAP benefits; but without that safety social net, she will go hungry.

Another constituent, Erin, is currently a pre-law student and is unemployed and recently found out she is pregnant. She is working really hard to make a better life for herself and her family, but right now she can only provide for herself; but she has a child to take care of and the SNAP cuts will hurt her ability to do that.

And, finally, there is Bertha, whose monthly SNAP benefit is \$310 a month. She is a single mom of four children, and that SNAP benefit gives her about 2 weeks' worth of food. Her paycheck barely covers daily expenses, so any cut—\$10, \$20, \$30—will have a serious impact on her family. And, oh, by the way, her kids are 9 months, 12 years old, 14, and 18.

So these are the real people who are being affected by these cuts, and it is not just the SNAP program. Unfortunately, this targeting of the poor for savings throughout the budget is nothing new by our colleagues on the other side. Those who are striving to break into the middle class face serious barriers to entry because the House Republicans' budget cut job training, they are about to cut unemployment benefits, they have cut child care assistance and funding for Head Start.

They are also trying to undermine the Affordable Care Act, which provides health insurance to many who could not afford it otherwise. I would like to tell you some stories of constituents in my district who have voluntarily shared their story and given me permission to share their story of the success of the Affordable Care Act.

One is Michelle. She is a constituent in Pahrump, Nevada, which is about an hour outside of Las Vegas in my district. Michelle enrolled in a plan on the exchange that will save her \$200 per month and allow her access to her OB/GYN services closer to home. She calls her enrollment in the program an

"overwhelmingly positive experience." Michelle is currently on a HIPAA-guaranteed plan that costs her about \$565 per month. If she gets sick and needs an urgent visit to the doctor or a mammogram or other OB/GYN service, she has to drive to Las Vegas from Pahrump, which I said is about an hour outside.

After enrolling in the Affordable Care Act, she will save more than \$200 a month and have access to local urgent visits and OB/GYN services in her community in Pahrump. Mr. Speaker, now is not the time to turn back the clock or leave constituents like Michelle behind.

There are other constituents who have also shared their stories with me—Jeronimo and Teresita. They have been without health insurance for 10 years and were finally able to receive affordable insurance through Nevada Health Link. So, if you are watching, go to [nevadahealthlink.com](http://nevadahealthlink.com) and sign up today.

There is another one—Victor and Yumaria. They had never had insurance before. They are a father and a daughter who were approved for a qualified health plan at an affordable price, and they are very happy and thankful to finally have insurance.

Then there is Lisa, who is also enrolled in Medicaid for her and her family, which she is entitled to based on the eligibility requirements.

In my home State, there are some 21 percent of Nevadans who are currently uninsured. More than 30 percent of the children in my State are uninsured. So not only is it the cuts to SNAP, the cuts to Head Start, to job training, to vital services that so many families depend on, but it is this undermining of vital social safety net programs that people in the middle class are striving to be a part of.

So I want to ask my colleague, Representative JEFFRIES, from New York, what are some of the positive economic impacts to the SNAP program? How can we help to reinforce this message that not only is this good for the families that we are talking about, but it is also good for the economy? And what about those 55,000 jobs that could be cut in the first year alone if the House GOP plan to cut these services goes into effect?

I yield the time to the gentleman from New York.

□ 2000

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the distinguished gentleman from the Silver State, and I think it is very important to note that in addition to the compassionate reasons to provide food assistance to hungry Americans in the greatest Nation in the world—that, it seems to me, should be sufficient enough reason for the government to act. But if that, for whatever reason, does not provide adequate motivation for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to deem it significant, to allow for the robust Supplemental Nutrition Assist-

ance Program to remain in effect, I would suggest that there are also economic benefits to making sure that we provide assistance to low-income Americans.

Every economist who has studied the sluggish nature of our economic recovery recognizes that perhaps the biggest problem that we confront is the inadequate nature of our consumer demand, that Americans, for a wide variety of reasons, aren't spending enough. One of the reasons on the low-income side of the socioeconomic strata is because poorer Americans just don't have the resources. One of the reasons why I support an increase in the minimum wage is because independent economists have clearly indicated that, if you put additional dollars in the hands of lower-income Americans, the likelihood is they will spend those dollars, which increases economic productivity because of the increase in consumer demand.

Similarly, if you have Americans who are food insecure and you provide them with additional resources in order to deal with the hunger problem in their household, they are not going to save that money. They are going to spend that money to deal with their food insecurity and that of their children. But that has a stimulant effect on the economy. It helps our economy grow. That was the reason why increased SNAP benefits were included in the Recovery Act.

As my colleague from Nevada indicated, as of November 1 of this month, those increased SNAP benefits have lapsed; therefore, you have got people all across America with \$20 to \$24 less per month that they can spend in trying to address the food insecurity issues that they have. That is a problem in America. That is why one of the reasons when we as Democrats talk about things that should be done to turn the economy around, to invest in America, we support a balanced approach to deficit reduction and economic recovery. The other side supports an approach that balances the budget on the backs of the most vulnerable in our society. My friends on the other side of the aisle will say: That is just hyperbole; what facts do you have to support that charge?

Well, is it hyperbole when you cut \$39 billion from the Supplement Nutrition Assistance Program that your intent is to balance the budget on the backs of the hungry in America? When your budget cuts \$168 billion in higher education spending, is it hyperbole to suggest that your intent is to balance the budget on the backs of younger Americans in pursuit of the American Dream through a college education? Is it hyperbole to suggest that when you cut \$810 billion from Medicaid, as your budget does, that your intent is to balance the budget on the backs of the sick and the afflicted and the poor in America? That is not hyperbole. These are the facts that your budget, your legislative action, have laid on the table.

Mr. HORSFORD. I would like to underscore a couple of points that the gentleman is making here. The first is the fact that this does disproportionately affect the poor and those who are striving to become a part of the middle class. At the same time, there are corporate subsidies, billions of dollars of corporate subsidies for the agriculture industry in the farm bill and in other legislation that has come before this House that they will move expeditiously and then leave the food behind in the farm bill, for the first time that I am aware of that we have approved a farm bill without also including the food assistance component to it. They later came back and included it, but with a \$40 billion cut.

And the positive economic impacts of this cannot be underscored either. I hear from representatives from the retail industry who tell me that SNAP creates some \$340 million in farm production for each \$1 billion of retail that is generated. There is some 3,300 farm jobs that are created for each \$1 billion of funding that is provided for; that for every \$1 billion of SNAP benefits, it also creates between 9,000 to 18,000 full-time jobs. So not only is this the right thing to do, not only is it the morally conscionable thing to do, it is also good for the economy.

And so as we make this argument, how important it is to debunk some of the myths surrounding SNAP, one of them being that there is fraud in the SNAP program and that is why the cuts aren't going to hurt the poor or those who are striving to be part of the middle class.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I think if I had a dollar for every time that a Member on the other side of the aisle claimed wage, fraud, or abuse in order to justify some egregious, draconian cuts, I would be a multimillionaire right now.

It is unfortunate that in the absence of legitimate facts, in order to justify going after these programs, that the allegation of waste or fraud or abuse, without a scintilla of systematic evidence, is laid on the table to justify actions, but let's be clear. The reason that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, have made the decision to go after programs like SNAP and higher education funding and a wide variety of our social safety net programs that have made America great in many ways is because, essentially, in the budget supported by the majority, passed in this House, Representative HORSFORD, the majority wants to take the top tax rate in America, 39.6 percent, and what they do in this budget, after making all of these egregious cuts, is to lower that top tax rate from 39.6 percent all the way down to 25 percent. Now, the argument is always made that the reason this is being done is because of stimulating the economy as a result of some well-worn, tired, trickle-down theory that has been proven to be discredited based on the facts as we know them over the previous two administrations.



And I will just briefly make that point related to why in the world would you, in 2013, make the argument that if you drop the tax rate from 39.6 percent to 25 percent and then cut \$39 billion from SNAP in order to try and do it, cut billions of dollars from higher education funding, voucherize Medicare, cut hundreds of billions from Medicaid, it is because you expect America to accept the argument that that is going to create a stimulating effect on the economy. Well, when the top tax rate was 39.6 percent during the 8 years of Bill Clinton's Presidency, 20 million jobs were created; when, under the Bush administration, the top tax rate was dropped to 35 percent, we lost approximately 650,000 jobs. The facts don't support the nature of your argument.

That is why we think that there is just absolutely no justification to engage in alleged cost-cutting behavior, such as cutting \$39 billion from SNAP in support of an economic theory that has widely been discredited.

Mr. HORSFORD. I thank the gentleman.

I would like to debunk another myth, and that is: just let the charities handle it. We have a number of great nonprofits out there, the church community, the faith-based community, can step up and fill the void.

Well, I would like to turn your attention to this chart which shows that, with all the great work that the nonprofits and the faith-based community is doing in addressing hunger and food insecurity, that amounted to about \$5 billion in estimated value of all food that is distributed by U.S. charities this year. That compares to \$5 billion that has already been cut since November 1 because of the setback, the so-called hunger cliff. This does not take into account the additional cuts that are on the horizon both in the Senate plan, which is about \$4.1 billion of additional cuts, compared to the House GOP plan, which again is estimated to be \$39 billion.

Now, I support the charities in my local communities. Three Square is our local food bank. They do a phenomenal job in southern Nevada in helping both our rural and urban areas, getting the needs of the families and the food that they need in those communities.

While my family and I will be making a donation to our local food bank and helping families get meals for Thanksgiving, that is not going to absorb the \$39 billion of cuts that are proposed by the other side. This is just another one of those examples where the arguments don't support reality.

We are living in reality. The families who are struggling on these benefits whose stories we have shared tonight are dealing with reality. It is not a mother who is raising her children who is struggling to make ends meet who wants to rely on SNAP benefits that is the problem with our budget. It is simply not. It is not the veterans who have served our country with distinction

and honor and who have come back, and because of the environment in their communities, they are also relying on SNAP benefits. They are not the problem with the Federal budget deficit. It is not the seniors at the Pahrump food bank that I visit who literally are having their meals cut back because of their draconian budget cuts. These American families are simply relying on a safety net that has been there and should be there in the wealthiest country in the world.

Now, I agree with my colleague who says that from a budget standpoint we have to tackle these problems, but there is a way to do it right. There is a way to do it without costing more in human toil, and there is a wrong way to do it. And the proposal by House Republicans to balance the budget on the backs of our children, our seniors, our veterans, the working poor and those who are striving to be part of the middle class is not it.

We will work with you on other ways to balance the budget, but it shouldn't be by making more families food insecure.

Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time we have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 5 minutes remaining.

□ 2015

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, in that remaining time, I would like to yield to my colleague, Mr. JEFFRIES, for any concluding remarks that he has, and then I will close out this Special Order hour.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the distinguished gentleman again for his tremendous leadership in bringing to the House floor such an important issue of concern to the African American community, but really of concern to all Americans.

Hunger is an issue that should be nonpartisan in nature. It affects urban America and parts of suburban America and certainly rural America. It affects individuals who are Black, who are White, who are Latino, who are Asian, all different religious groups and ethnic persuasions. It is an issue that we should be willing to work on on a nonpartisan basis to find common ground with folks on the other side of the aisle to address an issue that should trouble every single Member of the House of representatives.

How can it be that we accept the fact that there are 50 million Americans who are food insecure in the wealthiest Nation in the world?

I have traveled all over the district that I represent, and I hear the arguments of some on the other side of the aisle that the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP, as it is sometimes referred to, is a program that creates dependency. Well, I haven't met a single one of my constituents who chooses hunger as a lifestyle. It seems to me that is a rough style to choose.

These individuals, for one reason or another, find themselves in a tough

spot, and we in the Congress should be doing everything we can to try and help them out, to get them back on their feet, to put them in a position where they can move forward and make progress for themselves and for their families. Ultimately, that would mean progress for the community and for this country.

I thank the gentleman again for his leadership, and I look forward to working with you on this issue as we move forward.

Mr. HORSFORD. I thank the gentleman from New York for your leadership and commitment to this issue. You have come to this floor on many occasions to talk about the important issues facing our country, and you are always inclusive and factual. You make a compelling argument for why this body needs to take up these issues.

Let me just conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying not only do we reject \$40 billion in cuts to the food assistance program, but we are actually calling on our colleagues on the other side to work with us, to help make SNAP work even better for America's families, to build on the great things that SNAP already does. This program is actually one of the most successful antihunger programs that we have. It lifts more families out of poverty than most other programs.

Let me just close by sharing one example that we can be addressing. The example I want to close with is the Thrifty Food Plan, which is currently how SNAP benefits are currently calculated. The TFP is the lowest cost of the four food plans developed by the USDA, and it is unrealistic for a family of four.

A family of four receiving \$632 per month doesn't go very far in buying those fresh fruits and vegetables that my colleague talked about at the local farmers market. The current TFP formula fails to calculate difficulties associated with the lack of food availability. The fact that in many of our communities, both rural and urban, the accessibility to nutritious, wholesome meals and fruits and vegetables isn't even available. That falls disproportionately on the poor to have to pick up those costs. For example, it doesn't include the cost of transportation. It doesn't include food preparation time that so many working families struggle with. It leaves the average family of four with a \$200 monthly benefit shortfall.

Again, this is simply unacceptable. As the wealthiest Nation in the world, no American—not our children, not our veterans, not our seniors—should be forced to survive on what is now \$1.40 per meal. That is why, Mr. Speaker, we are here this hour to bring attention to this issue and to call upon our colleagues to work with us, to not implement these cuts and to make these programs work—not only SNAP, but Head Start and the other vital programs that so many families are depending on as part of that social safety net and the fabric of the American society.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the devastating impact of hunger in America. The debate surrounding cuts to nutrition assistance coupled with nationwide food insecurity is a recipe for disaster for our neediest citizens.

The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) is a vital tool that help feed Americans struggling economically. More than 90 percent of SNAP beneficiaries are children, elderly, veterans, or disabled. Four to six million low-income people will be affected by cuts to SNAP funding, including the 450,000 residents in Dallas County, that are food insecure, 300,000 of which are children.

The GOP's efforts to cut \$40 billion in SNAP are unconscionable and we must stand strong for the 16.4 percent of our population that remains food insecure. According to the USDA, one in every five Texas households experiences food insecurity. Out of the estimated 1.8 million Texas children, one in four live in food insecure households. Approximately 3.6 million Texas residents receive some type of federal food assistance.

In my district, I chair the Dallas Coalition for Hunger Solutions which is composed of organizations dedicated to fighting hunger and making Dallas County food secure. I strongly support the federal programs that work to support the needs of our citizens nationwide. I urge my colleagues to oppose any proposed cuts to nutrition assistance. Collectively, we can do so much to confront food insecurity in our nation.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, on November 1st, thousands of families in my congressional district saw a cut to their SNAP (food stamps) benefits. A family of four saw a loss of up to \$36 a month. Over the course of the next 12 months, many families across my district will lose more than 24 million meals. Michigan families are already struggling to put food on the table, and the last thing we should do is take food away from those who need it most. Unfortunately, this has already happened.

There's no sugarcoating it: we have a hunger problem in Michigan and across the United States. The majority of households receiving SNAP are those with children. It is our responsibility to protect—not cut—critical programs like SNAP for the families and kids who rely on them. That's why I introduced H.R. 3353, the "Extend Not Cut SNAP Benefits Act" which would extend the Recovery Act's 13.6% increase in SNAP for an additional year.

This extraordinarily low level of SNAP benefits under the new levels will force families to find ways to stretch their already limited benefits even further at the grocery store in order to put healthy, nutritious food on the table for their kids. With less money to spend on groceries each month, the importance of nutrition education becomes even more real.

Yet the House and Senate proposed deep cuts within the Farm Bill could cut SNAP by as much as an additional \$40 billion (on top of the cut we just saw on November 1st) and would cut funding for SNAP Education (SNAP-Ed). Keeping SNAP and SNAP-Ed strong isn't just the right thing to do—it's also the smart thing to do. Children who get enough of the healthy food they need, as a rule, face fewer health problems, do better in school and grow up to lead stronger, more productive lives.

## THE ABUSE OF POWER BY THE IRS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, thank you for the recognition. This evening, I would like to lead the discussion about the blatant abuse of power by the Internal Revenue Service, specifically regarding its targeting of Americans because of their political beliefs.

In early 2012, the Waco Tea Party contacted me to express concern about overly onerous information requests regarding their request to become a 501(c)(4) organization. I subsequently contacted the IRS to get answers, and I also contacted the House Ways and Means Committee and the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee to inform them of the situation that I had been made aware of. Unfortunately, following my inquiry into the IRS, the issue did not go away and, in fact, it got worse. I began to learn that this targeting was wide and spread throughout the country.

In April of 2012, I, along with 62 of my House colleagues, sent a letter to then-IRS Commissioner Doug Shulman requesting a response as to why the IRS was targeting and intimidating conservative groups. We received a basic, nonresponsive letter from the IRS that outlined how applications are processed and that in no way answered our questions on the targeting and the onerous questioning of the grassroots groups.

On May 10, 2013, just a little over a year later, the IRS officially apologized for inappropriately targeting conservative groups like the Waco Tea Party. The House Oversight and Government Reform Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee started and continued to conduct hearings into this targeting of conservative groups.

News reports would go on to reveal that senior IRS personnel knew about this practice as far back as 2011, directly contradicting earlier testimony of senior IRS personnel, who claimed that they did not know of these practices. I, along with my colleagues here on the House floor tonight, are far from satisfied with just an apology.

We have several letters from groups that we are going to share with you tonight. This needless and abusive targeting has burdened many conservative groups throughout the country. I have invited several of my colleagues to come to the House floor and to join me as we bring back to the forefront this blatant abuse of power from the IRS on conservative groups. Tonight, I would like to present the injustice that has been done by reading letters to Congress from these targeted groups that go into detail about their experiences.

The first letter is from a group in my district, Texas District 17. It is the

Waco Tea Party. Here is what their letter says:

We are writing to you to explain to you and to your colleagues what it is like to be targeted by the government via the Internal Revenue Service. We are not writing to explain the facts and details—that is all a matter for public record and the courts—but rather to explain what happens to United States citizens who simply exercise their rights under the law.

When we began the Waco Tea Party, we were regular Americans who spoke out about being taxed enough already. We weren't political operatives or politicians. For the most part, we were new to the world of politics. We were naive. We believed our government had problems, but we didn't realize that it would target citizens for their political beliefs, that it would put us on a "be on the lookout," or BOLO, list, for short, for using the words "Tea Party" in our name; that some Members of Congress would write to the IRS and demand action against us because we held a different position on policy.

We weren't targeted because we broke the law; we were targeted because we were compliant with the law. We weren't targeted because we spoke out; we were targeted because our viewpoints weren't acceptable to government bureaucrats at the IRS. The law was wrongly used against us in an attempt to shut us out and to shut us up.

The toll this IRS targeting is taking on our lives is immeasurable. The financial burden on our small grassroots group has been staggering, requiring many of us to dip into our household budgets to cover expenses, the sleepless nights worrying about what would happen if we couldn't find someone to help us, the emotional stress of explaining to your spouse, your children, family, and friends why you have to miss a special event or special day because we had to work on inane and intrusive demands by the IRS, questions that had nothing to do with our application but were instead used as a weapon of intimidation.

The countless nights that we have laid in our bed not able to sleep, the times that we quietly cried into a pillow because we don't want our spouse to know how scared we are, or the isolation we have felt because of how the media and even some Members of Congress have demonized us, none of this matters to an agent of the government. We are not seen as people. We deeply love our country. We are patriotic, and we are dedicated to preserving our birthrights guaranteed by the Constitution and passing them on to the next generation.

Our grandfathers, fathers, and others fought wars against countries that use government to squelch freedom and liberty of their citizens, only to find that out our own government was now engaging in these tactics. We are not ashamed of our country, but we are disgusted with our government and those who condone the IRS tactics.

We implore you to act to preserve political speech, free speech, to hold people accountable for what they have done to the American citizens. We pray that you and your colleagues will act to restrain government, punish those who were responsible, and restore our First Amendment rights to what the Founders intended.

Sincerely, Toby Marie Walker, Carol Waddell, Becky Kodrin, and Bobby Keith, Waco Tea Party members, supporters and volunteers.

Mr. Speaker, as I told you, there are several letters we have to share tonight. The next person I would like to invite to speak is RANDY WEBER from Texas District 14, and he will share

what some of his constituents have written to him.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Texas.

As we all know, in May of 2013, it was unearthed—that is probably a pretty good word, because they had it deeply buried in the government bureaucracy—that the IRS was unjustly targeting conservative 501(c)(4) groups and using aggressive intimidation tactics. Today, I rise with my colleagues to share the story of organizations that were unlawfully targeted by the IRS or Internal Revenue Service, as I like to refer to them.

In southeast Texas, in my district, Texas District 14—they are on the gulf coast—the Clear Lake Tea Party was just such a group, one of many that fell victim to the IRS' illegal—and I want to underscore that—illegal maneuvers.

On November 23, 2009, the Clear Lake Tea Party filed their 501(c)(4) tax exempt status. After having received no word from the IRS for almost 8 months, the founder of the Clear Lake Tea Party made an inquiry regarding the status of their application. What they got back from the IRS should shock and appall every American. Here is what Mary Huls, president of the Clear Lake Tea Party, sent our office, what they got back on July 12, 2010:

The Clear Lake Tea Party received an additional information request from Elizabeth Hofacre in the Cincinnati, Ohio, office of the IRS demanding 19 more nontax-related items to complete our application.

The Clear Lake Tea Party board was duly alarmed by the broad and personal nature of the information required, which we would have to deliver and declare under penalties of perjury. We judged the questions to be far outside the normal purview of a nominal request for a tax exempt designation.

For example, number one: they were requested to provide a list of speakers and their qualifications for events that the Clear Lake Tea Party have had in the prior year. They were asked to provide copies of information that was easily found on Facebook and Twitter.

□ 2030

And then, believe it or not, the Clear Lake Tea Party there in Galveston, Texas, Clear Lake, League City, Galveston County area, was asked to explain their relationship with the King Street Patriots, another Tea Party.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I was born at night, but it wasn't last night. What in the world does that have to do with their application for their own tax exempt (c)(4) status?

Number 4, they were asked to—and let me just hasten to add, they were not asked to explain their relationship with ACORN or moveon.org or Organizing For America.

Number 4, they were asked to explain the Operation Pink Slip Program and to provide literature concerning this program. How did you decide who would be fired?

Of course, the Clear Lake Tea Party, their immediate reaction upon receiving this information was confusion. You see, they had already been investigated by an IRS agent.

Well, after the IRS' beyond intrusive and illegal, I might add, investigation of the Clear Lake Tea Party, the Clear Lake Tea Party's board met and made the executive decision to withdraw their 501(c)(4) application and to file with the State of Texas as a Texas nonprofit corporation that pays taxes in order to practice and protect their First Amendment freedom of speech.

We got a subsequent email from Ms. Huls, president of the Clear Lake Tea Party, and she stated in that email that they would not be intimidated by this Federal agency or any other, and they would go down a different path. And so they chose to file as a Texas nonprofit.

Mr. Speaker, it is an absolute shame, and I will say a travesty, that the head of the IRS, the former head, could come up to testify in front of our committees, stick her finger in the face of the American taxpayer, in the eye, I would say, and say, I am going to claim the Fifth Amendment. I don't have to answer your questions. I don't have to be accountable to you. I don't have to be accountable to the American taxpayer.

And what I said to my district was, try that one on for size when the IRS wants to audit you. Get in front of their agents, their Gestapo, their henchmen and say, I plead the Fifth Amendment. I don't have to answer your questions, and see how that works.

It is unbelievable, Mr. Speaker, that in the United States of America, we are scrutinized for the applications we file and words are chosen like conservatives, King Street Patriots, and we are so deeply scrutinized as to drive the Clear Lake Tea Party to withdraw their (c)(4) tax exempt status.

Not in America should this ever happen. I am urging my colleagues in the House to join me and my fellow patriots all across this land to continue that cry that the justified scrutiny of the IRS to make sure two things, that those who did this are held accountable, and that it never, ever can happen again in the land of the free and the home of the brave.

Mr. Speaker, I am RANDY WEBER, and I love my country. It is the government I fear.

Mr. FLORES. I thank my friend from Texas (Mr. WEBER). And I am now honored to yield to another friend from the great State of Tennessee, MARSHA BLACKBURN, who represents the Tennessee Seventh.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding, and Mr. FLORES has really done a wonderful job of outlining the problem that we have come to the floor to address tonight.

Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, it is a problem and a situation that so many of our constituents never thought that they would witness or experience in this great Nation. They always felt that they had the right to free speech because it is a guaranteed right.

How dare that they, or their groups, find themselves subjected to mistreatment by a Federal Government agency because of what they chose to say or to do, all in defense of liberty and the Constitution of this great land.

Well, we had some of our Tennessee groups that were unjustly targeted through this process. They brought that to our attention because they realized that they were the brunt of this mistreatment, that they were facing a Federal Government agency who came bearing the power of the Federal Government to try to fear and intimidate citizens.

Yes, indeed, it is the example of the government turning against the citizens and the power of the government being used to silence the citizens.

So many of our constituents that were involved with this process said, What happened? How did this change? What has caused this to take place?

And what they began to say to us was, if they can do this to others, what are they going to do to us?

If they can do this to us in our group, what will they end up doing to others?

So we have worked very closely and continue to follow what is happening with these groups and, of course, have been very concerned, as we have heard and watched the hearings for how the IRS carried out this data-mining and these word searches.

I have to tell you, Mr. Speaker, it is no doubt at all, no doubt in my mind at all why the American people are so concerned about the security of the President's health care law. They know that their data may be used against them because they have living proof with the IRS, that they took information, applications, donors to groups, and then they turned that information against those donors from those groups in order to silence them and to impair their free speech.

I want to read a letter tonight from one of the groups in my district, in our State, that has been unfairly and unjustly treated by the IRS. And this one comes from Linchpins of Liberty. It is stating their posture as of October 21 of this year.

And the gentleman who is the executive director of Linchpins of Liberty is a gentleman named Kevin Kookogey, who started his organization because he loves his country. He loves freedom. He wants to preserve this for his children and future generations.

So he did what a lot of Americans do, decided to put together an organizational structure that individuals could come together under to further the cause of freedom, something more individuals could and should do.

But this is what happened to him, and I am quoting from his letter, which I will enter, Mr. Speaker, as a part of the permanent record for the proceedings of this evening:

Dear Congresswoman Blackburn,

As you know, I am president and founder of Linchpins of Liberty, an American Leadership Development Enterprise.

On January 2, 2011, we filed our application with the IRS seeking to obtain a 501(c)(3) status as an educational organization.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that date is important. January 2, 2011:

For over 33 months now, the IRS has unlawfully delayed and obstructed that application. Under threat of perjury, the IRS has demanded that I disclose the identities of my students, some of whom are minors. One letter from the IRS contained in excess of 90 inquiries of intimidation intended to force me to disclose my donors and to identify the political affiliation of my mentors.

This has come at great cost to me. I have already lost a \$30,000 grant from a reputable nonprofit whose executive director advised me that he had never seen such treatment of a 501(c)(3) applicant in his 25 years of making grants.

On June 5, 2013, the day after I testified before Congress, I then lost most of my business when my largest client advised me that it was uncomfortable with the public expression of my political views in defending my constitutional rights.

A few days later, Congressman McDermott suggested on national television that I may have lied before Congress simply because I was not under oath when I testified. Perhaps he was projecting, because I don't make a distinction between whether or not I am under oath. I tell the truth all the time.

If the intent of the administration is to intimidate and silence the voices of freedom, then it has grossly misjudged its citizens. The government is not our master. It is our agent. We are the principals, and we delegate our rights. We do not surrender them.

I therefore respectfully appeal to you to confront this abuse of power by the executive branch, and, in so doing, to protect, defend and preserve human liberty for ourselves and our posterity.

Sincerely, Kevin Kookogey, president and founder, Linchpins of Liberty.

Mr. Speaker, when you read the letters such as the one from Mr. Kookogey, such as the ones that you are going to hear from other organizations tonight, what you realize is there is an outstanding field of questions relative to what has transpired with the IRS:

Why did they go about this?

What was their purpose?

Was it maliciousness?

Were their actions purposeful?

Was it intended to silence, to silence those that stand in opposition to the practices and the positions of this administration?

Those are some of the questions that our constituents are still seeking to find the answers to. They would like to have their IRS designation because they recognize we are a Nation of laws. We abide by the law, and they would seek to operate within the law.

OCTOBER 21, 2013.

Re Linchpins of Liberty—The Cost of Speaking for Freedom

Hon. MARSHA BLACKBURN,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN BLACKBURN: As you know, I am President and Founder of Linchpins of Liberty: An American Leadership Development Enterprise.

On January 2, 2011, we filed our application with the IRS, seeking to obtain 501(c)(3) status as an educational organization.

For over 33 months now, the IRS has unlawfully delayed and obstructed that application. Under threat of perjury, the IRS has demanded that I disclose the identities of my

students—some of whom are minors. One letter from the IRS contained in excess of ninety (90) inquiries of intimidation intended to force me to disclose my donors and to identify the political affiliation of my mentors!

This has come at great cost to me. I have already lost a \$30,000 grant from a reputable non-profit whose Executive Director advised me that he had never seen such treatment of a 501(c)(3) applicant in his 25 years of making grants.

On June 5, 2013, the day after I testified before Congress, I then lost most of my business when my largest client advised me that it was uncomfortable with the public expression of my political views in defending my Constitutional rights.

A few days later, Congressman McDermott suggested on national television that I may have lied before Congress simply because I was not under oath when I testified. Perhaps he was projecting, because I don't make a distinction between whether or not I am under oath. I tell the truth ALL the time.

If the intent of the Administration is to intimidate and silence the voices of freedom, then it has grossly misjudged its citizens. The government is not our master. It is our agent. We are the principals, and we delegate our rights. We do not surrender them.

I therefore respectfully appeal to you to confront this abuse of power by the Executive Branch, and in so doing to protect, defend, and preserve human liberty, for ourselves and our posterity.

Sincerely,

KEVIN KOOKOGEY,

President & Founder, Linchpins of Liberty.

Mr. FLORES. I thank the Congresswoman from Tennessee.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the words that were shared with us from the gentle lady from Tennessee, from one of her constituents. And we hear firsthand the agonizing feelings of her constituents as they have experienced the abuse of an overreach of Federal power by this feared agency, the IRS.

I am now pleased to yield to another one of my good friends. Representative LANKFORD from Oklahoma will share what some of the folks in Oklahoma Five think about what the IRS has done.

□ 2045

Mr. LANKFORD. Thank you to my colleague for hosting this.

Mr. Speaker, about 3½ years ago, Americans started getting more and more frustrated. It is really a product of several years of building, this sense of helplessness as they struggled and watched their Nation—I don't even know how to begin to describe the emotions that really welled up about 4 years ago when Americans watched their health care beginning to slip away. This absolute divide that happened as a Nation between Republicans and Democrats—and they used to try to work together to try to resolve things—went out the window on a pure partisan vote to push through a health care change that not a single Republican voted for. And Democrats, in a skittish way, pushed it with glee while others stepped back and said, I hope this works the way it is being advertised.

As we know now, it is not working. It is working exactly as many Republicans said it would work. And the im-

pulse of the Federal Government to take over more and more would actually cause serious problems in the process.

At the same time, the United States Government began to overspend more than it ever had in the history of the United States. Mr. Speaker, \$1.45 trillion of overspending in a single year led millions of Americans to stop and to gather—many of them for the first time—gather in small groups and say, Our government is really struggling. This is not going, as a Nation, how we thought it would go. And they gathered together in small groups, which were spontaneously called these Tea Party groups, groups of patriots and individuals, housewives, moms, business leaders, and guys that owned locksmith shops, and all of these different places that were around just started gathering together to say, What can we do? Just normal Americans.

As they began to form and to meet in groups of five, 10, 20, 25—sometimes they would meet with huge rallies of 100 or 200 people. But most of the time, it is at somebody's house. Most of the time it is at a VFW meeting place or some other spot. They determined, Well, we need to get organized, and we need to be able to pass out materials and do some things. And to do that in our governmental system, they have got to try to find some way to be able to organize that money together, which means they need to contact the Internal Revenue Service and be able to access and get a revenue number. Well, they started that.

One of those groups was in Oklahoma, a group called Oklahoma City Patriots in Action. This group of individuals are just normal Oklahoma great folks. They got together, submitted their application, and went through the process they needed to do. And then they get a letter back with 21 questions, some of them having up to nine subquestions to it. Sixty-five total requests came back to this group of individuals saying, We will give you your number if you will tell us all of this information. And to accentuate it, the letter begins with first them needing to sign this statement:

Under penalties of perjury, I declare that I have examined this information, including accompanying documents, and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, the information contains all the relevant facts relating to the request for the information, and such facts are true, correct, and complete.

And then they go on to make 65 different data requests, many of them incredibly long.

There is no question this letter is intended to intimidate people; but I can tell you from knowing these Oklahomans, they tried to intimidate the wrong people with this.

So let me just give you an example of some of the things they began to ask for in this long list of questions. They asked things like:

Do you directly or indirectly communicate with members of legislative bodies? If so,

provide copies of the written communications and contents of other forms of communications.

In other words, if you redress grievances to your elected officials, as our Constitution allows you to do, please provide us a copy of everything you said when you went to your government for a redress of grievances.

How about this:

Give detailed examples on how you will educate the public concerning key legislation and the positions of political candidates and elected officials on that legislation.

Please explain how you obtain the current legislative information, both State and Federal, and the turnaround time to post on your Web site.

Why in the world does it matter what their turnaround time is—whether they post it in a day or 10 days—for your IRS application?

How about this:

Please provide copies of your current Web pages from your Web site.

Wouldn't it be easier just to ask for the Web site name and then go search it themselves? They wouldn't have to print out copies of every page.

And here are two sets of my favorites, of this long list. I could go on and on with it. This asks:

Have you conducted or will you conduct rallies or exhibitions for or against any public policies, legislation, public officers, political candidates, or like kinds? If yes, please explain and provide the following: State the time, location, and content schedule of each rally or exhibition. Provide copies of handouts you provided or will provide to the public. The names of persons from your organization and the amount of time they have spent or will spend on the event.

One last piece—and again, I could go on and on with this. This is the one that, when I read through this, it continued just to make my blood boil:

Have any candidates running for public office spoken or will they speak at a function of your organization? If so, provide the names of the candidates, the functions at which they spoke, any materials distributed or published with regard to their appearance and the event, any video or audio recordings of the event, and a transcript of any speeches given by the candidates.

Now, these are a gatherings of 20 people sitting around in someone's house. They are not transcribing every part of everything that is said. These are normal Americans getting together to discuss what is going on in their government. And the IRS said, If you want to continue to do this and be organized, we need to get a transcript of every speech that was done around your kitchen table.

And to add insult to injury, remember what I said at the beginning, Under penalties of perjury, if you don't provide completely everything in this, you are not eligible.

What is this intended to do? This is intended to silence. This is intended to tell good, hardworking Americans, Be quiet, sit around your dining room table, don't organize, don't keep moving.

Now when our committee asked about this, the Oversight and Govern-

ment Reform Committee, which I serve on, when we asked about this initially and began pushing forward to get more information—because as the folks in Oklahoma City know, this is not an isolated event. Letters like this, with other questions, went to other places all over the country, to everyone who had the name “Tea Party,” had the word “liberty,” or had the word “patriot” in their name. They were assigned to a specific group in Cincinnati, and they dead-ended all in that one group.

Now, initially, when we asked individuals about it, we were told this was just a crazy group of folks in Cincinnati that went rogue, as if they all worked for WKRP, and they were out there just being crazy in Cincinnati.

When we asked those quote-unquote “rogue” agents in Cincinnati to come before our committee and to tell us about it, what we were told was very clear. They were following the instructions they got from Washington, D.C., on what to do with these applications. And a special group was set up that all they did was take in applications that had “Tea Party,” “liberty,” or “patriot” in it. And when they arrived at that location, they were to sit there and wait for instructions from Washington, D.C.

So we asked the Cincinnati folks, Who gave you those instructions in Washington, D.C.? Those individuals were then called before our committee. And we asked those individuals, Did you give instructions to the Cincinnati office? Yes. Why did you do that? Here was their statement:

Because we were told by the IRS counsel to wait on their instructions.

We are now in the process of doing interviews with the IRS counsel to say, Why was the decision made to say, people with certain names, send them letters like this with no intention of ever answering them? That they would get 65 detailed requests like this, each providing a very long response needed? And that then when it was finally collected, they would dead-end in Cincinnati. Why? We are still trying to get that answer.

Why does that matter? Because Americans, whether they be liberal, conservative, anything in between should have a government that serves them, rather than intimidates them. It is right that we continue to walk through this process. It is right that good, hardworking Americans are not intimidated by their government.

This is something that needs to be resolved and will be resolved, and though the headlines have faded away on it, we have not forgotten these individuals. And we will continue to work through the process to be held to account and to make sure this doesn't happen to anyone again in the days ahead.

I thank the gentleman for hosting this time so that these folks in Oklahoma City and around the country are not forgotten.

Mr. FLORES. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) for sharing with us more chilling evidence of a Federal Government that has gone wild and how the Federal Government can target you based on what is in your name.

I would now like to yield to my good friend from Texas, Mr. LOUIE GOHMERT, from Texas' District One.

Mr. GOHMERT. I thank my dear fellow alumnus of Texas A&M. We do go way back, knowing each other from undergraduate days.

I want to follow up, and I am very grateful for my friend from Texas (Mr. FLORES) taking charge of this hour, setting it up to talk about the IRS and the abuses.

And I know we have been talking about the abuses of Tea Party conservative groups, pro-Israel groups; but I wanted to just touch in brief on the extent of the arrogance of the IRS. They feel like they are above the law. Lois Lerner never showed any remorse for what certainly appears not only to have been perjury but also to have been a crime. There is a specific criminal code provision dealing with abuses of the Internal Revenue office.

And you have Kathleen Sebelius. And right now, of course, people all over the country, millions are losing or have lost their health insurance. And there was this article here in October. This was from CNN News:

In an interview with CNN's Dr. Sanjay Gupta Tuesday night, Health and Human Services Secretary Kathleen Sebelius said she won't be enrolling in the problem-plagued health insurance system that she was charged to implement. “I have created an account on the site. I have not tried signing up, because I have insurance.”

Well, she—like the IRS—has Federal employee insurance, and they don't care about everybody else, but we know the head of Health and Human Services says she is not going to bother with it.

And as we look into the arrogance of the Internal Revenue Service—and I especially appreciate my friend from Texas, BILL FLORES, bringing this up because I don't know how many CPAs we have in Congress—but I know the CPA exam was a lot tougher than the bar exam. And I certainly appreciate somebody that knows about dealing with the IRS.

But this article, “IRS Employees' Union Urges Members to Oppose Obamacare—For Themselves.” And the article goes on. So NTEU, which is the union for Treasury employees, is strongly urging its members, including the IRS agents tasked with implementing ObamaCare, to oppose DAVE CAMP's legislation which would compel them to personally participate in the same health care program they will be enforcing. On the NTEU Web site, union members are urged to email their Congressmen and Senators and ask them to oppose H.R. 1780. It provides a sample letter that they should provide, saying:

I am a Federal employee and one of your constituents. I am very concerned about legislation that has been introduced by Congressman Dave Camp to push Federal employees out of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program and into the insurance exchanges established under the Affordable Care Act.

It is just the height of arrogance that the IRS, while they are investigating groups that believe in the propriety and fidelity of the United States Constitution—because somehow they are a threat to the United States Constitution because they believe in it—at the same time, they know they are gearing up to enforce ObamaCare and to delve into the most private information that people have. It is not enough to just look at financial information. They are going to be looking to see about their health care and their health care coverage and can get even more detail than what we have been hearing during this hour.

I can't imagine a worse prescription for abandoning the Constitution than that. And not only that, we have heard that ObamaCare—correctly, apparently—that it will cause the hiring of 17,000, 18,000 new IRS agents. And although I was not a math major, I love math and did very well every time I took it, but if you multiply 56,000 times 18,000 IRS employees, in 1 year you have added over \$1 billion to health care costs. And there is not one of those 18,000 IRS agents, as arrogant as they may be and as personal as they are going to get, that are going to do anything but create a need for health care and not provide any whatsoever.

□ 2100

They may cause some ulcers. They are certainly not going to solve or be a solution for someone's ulcers. We still don't have proper accountability for the IRS.

One other thing about the IRS and their handling of this. We keep being told that there are 5 million people that have lost their policies. As I understand it, it is 5 million policies. We are talking about a lot more than 5 million people. And when you think about the people that are going to have to pay for their health care and the extra billion dollars for new IRS agents and the billions of dollars over time that will be paid for the navigators and all those people that won't provide any health care whatsoever, it is staggering.

People across America, from the polls, are figuring out this isn't about their health care. This is about the GRE—the government running everything.

And some people I know wonder, well, what solution is there? Even if you had a fair tax or a flat tax, you still have got to have an IRS.

And I love Arthur Laffer, Reagan's economic adviser. He said, Louie, you don't have to have the IRS. You ought to do away with it.

The problem with the IRS is that, of course, they are going to get arrogant

because they pick who they are going to audit, just like we have seen with all these abuses. They pick what all they are going to audit, just as we have been hearing. They get so intrusive, so personal, and then they decide what your punishment is going to be.

There is no other area like it in America, and I don't think the Founders anticipated that the IRS or any entity would ever exist that could be the prosecutor, the judge, the jury, and the executioner all. And that is why Arthur Laffer says you need to get rid of the IRS and have an auditing agency that is a fraction of the size of the IRS.

They don't get to pick whom they audit. That is done completely at random. They never get to pick whom they audit. And they never get to decide what will be done with their auditing. It has to be passed on to Justice or to the collection of the taxes if they have not been paid. They never get to participate in that. And I like the way that sounds, especially the more we hear about the abuses of people that are just freedom-loving Americans.

So I appreciate very much my friend taking this time so we can talk about the IRS. And I realize that he knew when he signed up for this hour that there would be others to come. And it is a brave thing because he is risking an audit as we go in because he knows better than anybody just how abusive the IRS can get.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments of Mr. GOHMERT. I think he raises an issue that all Americans rightly need to be concerned about, and that is the invasion of our privacy that we expect to have under our Constitution when you have an IRS that is looking into your personal records.

Mr. Speaker, I did get a letter from the IRS about 6 weeks after I wrote my letter to them demanding an answer for what they were doing to the Waco Tea Party. So I think they are targeting everybody. They don't care who they target. It seems like they are on a mission to try to squelch opposition to this administration's policies.

I would now like to yield to a brand-new freshman Member from Florida. Mr. DESANTIS from Florida's Sixth District is going to share some stories about what his constituents have experienced with the IRS.

Mr. DESANTIS. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. Speaker, the power to tax is the power to destroy, and so when you have the government using that taxing power to target individual Americans based on their exercise of First Amendment rights, that really is the utmost seriousness in terms of the threat that that represents to constitutional government.

I received a letter from one of my constituents a couple of weeks back named Carole McManus, and she is a leader in a conservative group in northeast Florida. They are basically dedicated towards educating about con-

stitutional government, individual freedom, the rule of law, and traditional American principles. I would think that that would be something that we would be applauding, especially in this day and age.

Well, they had to go through this situation with the IRS. So they submitted an application and they waited for a month, 3 months, 6 months, a year. It took 18 months for the IRS to respond to their inquiry; and when the IRS responded, did they approve the group, as would be a matter of course, particularly for groups that were recognized as representing a liberal perspective? No. They were given a list of very intrusive questions about the operation of their group.

I actually saw this firsthand during the 2012 election, because I went just to shake hands with folks one night just to see how people were doing, and all the group leaders were scared that I was there because they didn't want to get hit by the IRS. They didn't want to do anything wrong.

And so what the IRS was able to do by stretching this out, by submitting all these intrusive questions, they really chilled these folks from feeling confident in being able to exercise their First Amendment rights. And they did look scared about what could happen to them just because I happened to show up even though it was not a partisan event. I was shaking hands and we were talking about this stuff.

So I appreciate the gentleman from Texas organizing this hour.

The frustrating thing about it is, yes, you may have impropriety in any given administration, but what we have now with the IRS is we have a lot of career bureaucrats who have their own ideological bent. We have people like Lois Lerner, who take it upon themselves to target groups that they think deserve targeting. And the problem with that is nobody ever elected Lois Lerner to anything. Essentially, she is a nameless, faceless bureaucrat that you have just got to hope the point of view that you are trying to pursue is not one that she finds objectionable.

That lack of accountability, not knowing whether the bureaucracy will come down on you, that is a problem with the IRS. That is a problem in any of these agencies, quite frankly.

So I think the more that Americans understand the threat that is posed by a runaway bureaucracy, I think the better. I would like to see some far-reaching reforms so that we are protecting taxpayers and we are protecting American citizens in the exercise of their right.

And you know what? If the bureaucracy steps out of bounds, there ought to be consequences for that. The idea that somehow Lois Lerner is going to retire with full pay and benefits and not be held responsible at all, even though she couldn't even testify in front of the Oversight Committee, I think that rubs a lot of Americans wrong.



So I thank the gentleman from Texas for organizing this. I really appreciate the attention that you have focused on this issue.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for that heartfelt testimony today. I would also like to thank him for his years of service in the United States Navy and as a current member of the United States Naval Reserve. We appreciate having people like this that serve our country.

It is a shame that Americans who serve their country, whether they are in Congress or just a member of a local Tea Party, are targeted because of the fact that they are concerned about what is happening in Washington, what is happening from an administration or from the nameless, faceless bureaucrats that you heard of a few minutes ago.

Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time we have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. FLORES. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We have, as I told you at the outset of this conversation, many letters that we received from folks all over this country. And I am not going to read all these letters, but I am going to include some of them in the RECORD of tonight's proceedings.

One letter is from Amen, or Abortion Must End Now, that talks about how they were targeted. The Greenwich Tea Party Patriots of South Jersey wrote in about how they were targeted and the IRS treated them.

You heard Mr. DESANTIS from Florida talk about the First Coast Tea Party and how they were targeted, so their letter is going to be part of the RECORD. The Hawaii Tea Party writes in and talks about their experiences with the IRS. The Kentucky 9/12 Project has written in to talk about what they experienced.

The Manassas Tea Party next door in Virginia has written in to talk about how long it took for them to have their application reviewed and how they were bullied and insulted.

You heard Mr. LANKFORD talk about the OK Tea Party and Patriots in Action Association. The Patriots Educating Concerned Americans Now, or PECAN for short, in California, we got a letter from them. The Roane County Tea Party from Tennessee, we have got a letter from them.

We also have a letter from the San Fernando Valley Patriots in California that talks about the IRS treatment and the abuse. Actually, this one is sort of interesting because it has a poem, so I am going to read this one.

Again, this is from the San Fernando Valley Patriots in California. This letter starts with a poem entitled, "Our Grassroots Voice," by Karen Kenney, coordinator, San Fernando Valley Patriots:

The faces of the San Fernando Valley Patriots are different from our voice.

We are Democrats, Republicans, and Independents, but patriots all.

We speak as one with a love of God and country.

But our voice is a whisper against the roar that is this government.

We began as a "tea party" group in May 2009 near Los Angeles; born from the tax burdens within the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act.

A government too big, makes each citizen small, we thought. The First Amendment would offer a platform for us to speak politically, but we were wrong. Our government unsheathed its sword: the IRS.

The IRS did what tyranny does: threaten and control. The questionnaires sent to us were consuming; their intent to test our resolve.

But liberty prefers to stand and be heard.

We held more than 85 events in 2 years, but donations dropped and costs rose. We could afford fewer speakers, rallies, and handouts.

In July 2012, we withdrew our application for tax-exempt status with the IRS after 20 months of delays and grueling red tape.

We must now pay nonprofit taxes in California. The minimum is \$800 annually.

We have little money, but more people.

On June 4, 2013, the Ways and Means Committee heard our voice.

Now, our voice is stronger and more heard. God bless America.

And here is their letter:

On June 4, 2013, we told our story to the Ways and Means Committee. We did not plead the Fifth. We did not hide the facts. We did not lie. Our voice rose against the tyranny that is the IRS scandal. We told the truth of how a government too big makes each citizen small. We told the truth of abuse of power by the fist of a grinding bureaucracy.

We spoke of demand-and-delay tactics that cut our funds and public face. The IRS kept pounding, and we stopped our application for tax relief. But we did not stop meeting, teaching, and talking about the Constitution.

Now we have fewer speakers, fewer rallies, and fewer resources. But our resolve is undaunted. You see, we stand firmly with the First Amendment, not the Fifth.

God bless this Nation. God bless its people. God bless our liberty.

Karen Kenney, San Fernando Valley Patriots.

We have a letter from the Shelby County Liberty in Ohio. We have the Unite in Action from Nashville, Tennessee. We have the Wetumpka Tea Party from Alabama, who wrote in about their treatment at the hands of an overreaching IRS.

The Liberty Township Tea Party from Ohio has written in. The Richmond Tea Party, again, from next door in Virginia, has a letter that they want Americans to know about. The Rochester Tea Party Patriots in Minnesota, and the Greater Phoenix Tea Party Patriots in Arizona have written in.

On our Web site at flores.house.gov we have a timetable of when the IRS started this and what processes they went through and the lies that were told to the American people about what they were doing. And then we also had some testimony about when they came clean and when IRS officials started to resign. So it would be fascinating for Americans to be able to see that.

Mr. Speaker, the IRS is supposed to enforce our tax laws with integrity and

fairness. Yet here we are, 6 months later, and the Obama administration has done nothing more than to try and ride out the storm without taking action.

Lois Lerner and Doug Shulman have resigned from the IRS. However, they are still entitled to live the rest of their lives living on the backs of the hardworking American taxpayers that they abused when they were with the IRS.

□ 2115

Mr. Speaker, folks like Lerner and Shulman should never be allowed to get away with behavior like this and to get on Federal retirement. The IRS must stop targeting certain individuals and groups for partisan reasons. It is time that the administration gives Congress the information that we have requested over and over and over again so that the American people will know the facts and so that they will know that these practices are no longer being done. Americans deserve and demand transparency from government agencies, and they deserve compliance with law and with the Constitution.

My colleagues and I remain committed to finding answers and to putting a stop to this injustice. Mr. Speaker, I would like for every Federal bureaucrat who has tried to abuse the American people to have to submit their testimony with this same language that they requested from these everyday Americans who were just trying to stand up and exercise their First Amendment rights. I would like them to say:

Under penalties of perjury, I declare that I have examined this information, including the accompanying documents, and to the best of my knowledge and belief, the information that all the relevant facts relating to the request for information and such facts are true, correct and complete.

This is what Lois Lerner should have had to provide, not plead the Fifth. As I said before, my colleagues and I remain committed to finding answers and to putting a stop to this injustice.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for allowing us to bring this issue back to the forefront as we continue to look for answers and demand action. We will reassure the American public that the IRS and other Federal agencies will not scrutinize individuals and groups for political or ideological party reasons.

I also submit for the RECORD the letters that we received tonight.

I would ask that all Americans tonight continue to pray for their country during these difficult times for our military men and women and for our first responders.

I will close by saying, God bless America.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

AMEN (Abortion Must End Now)

AMEN (Abortion Must End Now) is a faith-based organization dedicated to defending the sanctity of life from its moment of conception. The Internal Revenue Service targeted AMEN, accusing us of being political.

Months into our 501c3 filing, AMEN received a letter from the IRS, not fully understanding the terminology, I phoned them. The IRS specialist shared with me that we could be seen as being "too political". The specialist continued to explain that the references to religion within our Mission statement could be an issue. The IRS also informed me that our name, AMEN (Abortion Must End Now) could be seen as "political" because it infers, "we aim to abolish abortion." I questioned, "We would have to change our name and Mission?" the IRS Specialist responded, "Most likely." I shared with the specialist that if we changed our name and Mission, we would no longer be the same organization.

It is because of the statements made by the IRS that we ignored future letters to pursue our tax-exempt status. We felt with abortion silencing the voices of over 3,200 American babies each day, we could not allow the IRS to silence ours.

The abuse of the IRS has truly impacted our organization. We operate on a very low budget, as many are unable to donate without having the advantage of a tax credit. We feel that our growth has been stunted due to the unethical actions of the IRS. We also feel that we continue to be a target as after our application for tax exemption in 2009, 2 out of 3 Directors of AMEN have been audited.

AMEN was targeted because we believe in defending the Unalienable Right to Life. The IRS has acted unlawfully and it is this unlawful abuse that must be aborted.

God Bless America,

KRISTY LIEN, *President.*

Greenwich Tea Party Patriots of South Jersey (New Jersey)

In early 2011, our organization, The Greenwich Tea Party Patriots of South Jersey filed an application for an exemption from Federal income tax and are still "in the process."

It is the desire of our organization to simply educate and informs the public concerning policies and issues that are taking place in our society. Membership includes a large number of elderly who do not have computers so newsletters are sent at least monthly via regular mail. Our primary reason for asking for this exemption was simply to get a better rate when mailing newsletters. Although we do take advantage of the "bulk rate" price allowed to us due to the number of pieces we send, the price for an exempted organization is significantly lower.

Most Americans historically are extremely intimidated by the IRS and the scandal that was created by the IRS and has made most citizens even more apprehensive.

Our organization has been irreparably affected by this scandal.

For instance, we have had a booth at our county fair for several years now. In the past, many people wanted to sign up on our mail list to get information. This year, only a few people wanted to put their name on the "sign-up" form with most saying, "I'm not putting my name on that and risk being audited by the IRS."

Many people have also told us that they would love to give us a nice donation but are afraid the "IRS will find out and they will be targeted."

All we wanted was a better rate for mailing our newsletters and we are still awaiting the process.

Sincerely,

BRENDA ROAMES, *President.*

FIRST COAST TEA PARTY (FLORIDA)

I know you are familiar with the First Coast Tea Party that encompasses members

in the NE area of Florida (specifically most members are from Duval, St. Johns and Clay counties). I wanted to bring our group's IRS issue (following our 8/31/10 501c4 application) to your attention.

As our group was going thru a transition with the leadership of our organization, in early 2012, we received a letter from the IRS requesting additional information before the IRS could/would complete their consideration of our application for exemption. Early 2012, was a hectic period for our volunteer tea party group.

Leadership changes and the kick-off of our 2012 focused goals to help with getting out the vote, was now interrupted with the IRS request for responses to 11 comprehensive questions regarding our organization. This request came nearly 18 months after we sent in our application. (Note: The letter from the IRS was dated January 31, 2012 with a request for our response by February 21, 2012.)

At the time of this request from the IRS, I was responsible for answering the questions with the assistance of our CPA and the help of volunteers with the FCTP.

As a young volunteer organization, our files, etc. were not fully established and yet the window to complete the request was upon us. Gathering the data and providing samples (where specifically asked) was time intensive and costly. We met the deadline and sent off 4 pounds of paper to the IRS.

We had not provided the information completely, in the eyes of the IRS, so on July 16th with an added request for information from 2 comprehensive questions, the FCTP responded to the IRS on August 7, 2012. Again, this interruption to our 2012 election year focus was frustrating and seemed like a diversion. We worked with Mr. Grant Herring from a Cincinnati, Ohio office of the IRS.

We received our 501c4 status in November of 2012.

Regards,

CAROLE MCMANUS.

HAWAII TEA PARTY

Hawaii Tea Party also known as TEA Party Maui is a non-partisan educational group which sought recognition and standing with the IRS under provision 501(c)4 for Tax-Exempt, Non-Profit status.

From the very beginning of our 755 day ordeal, which began with our original application in May 2010, and continued until our eventual receipt of official IRS approval in July 2012; we were targeted, thwarted, intimidated, and subjected to unreasonable and over-reaching demands that were far afield of the intent of the screening of such applications. Bear in mind that normally, 501(c)4 applications were routinely granted by the IRS within 90 to 180 days. The IRS delays in returning follow-up telephone calls and emails and their stonewalling of our requests for information only served to exacerbate our in-limbo status; which in effect shrunk attendance at our meetings, lessened participation in our events, and diminished the donations we did receive. But most significantly, the IRS actions created in the general public a fear of association and identification with the TEA Party name; and with our membership, an overwhelming fear of personal identification and harassment by the IRS. All of this conspired to place us in the unenviable position of not being able to fully participate in the democratic process for the important 2010 mid-term election cycle, as well as the 2012 national elections.

As of this writing, October 2013, we have learned that our suspicions during the 755-day ordeal of an IRS campaign targeting suppression of our Freedom of Speech, Freedom of Assembly, and Freedom to Redress

our Grievances have proved to be true. We believe that all Americans should find this illegal activity by the IRS outrageously egregious and demand full accountability by the persons involved and that they be prosecuted to the full extent of the law.

Sincerely,

TEA PARTY MAUI BOARD OF DIRECTORS.

KENTUCKY 9/12 PROJECT

It is with sadness for our country that I write this to inform you of what we went through and implore you to fix what we have become. Kentucky 9/12 Project filed its application for 501(c)(4) in December, 2010 with great confidence that all of its activities, relations, and dealings fell well within the bounds of that which defines that status. We as citizens were then targeted and held hostage by this administration at the arms of the IRS for over two years. During this time of uncertainty we were directly hindered in our fund raising and abilities to serve the people that shared our principles in the communities and state we live in. This is far greater than a financial impact and to us this was never about a bureaucracy verses some large organization but a government directly attacking and trying to silence ordinary individual people and thought. Personally this fundamentally changed me and it was with great consternation for me and my family that we went forward with a federal lawsuit against the IRS and United States of America. I would hope that those we elected and our representatives on both side of the isle would see the severity of this as a wakeup call to what we have become. As for me, I shall and we should be forever fearful of what government has become and can and may do to any of us.

Respectful Regards,

ERIC WILSON.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mrs. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1471. An act to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of the Army to reconsider decisions to inter or honor the memory of a person in a national cemetery, and for other purposes.

S. 1545. An act to extend authorities related to global HIV/AIDS and to promote oversight of United States programs.

#### FREEDOM AND TECHNOLOGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHR-ABACHER) for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, there is a piece of legislation that will be going through the Judiciary Committee on Wednesday that the American people need to be alerted about. It goes right to the heart of our prosperity, right to the heart of our national security, right to the heart of the well-being of average Americans.

Our Founding Fathers believed that with technology and freedom—and, yes, with the profit motive—that those things would uplift all of humankind and that this would be the formula that would make America a great Nation. In fact, they wrote into our Constitution a mandate that guarantees

the rights of inventors and authors. It is the only place in the body of the Constitution that the word “right” is used.

I quote article I, section 8, clause 8 of the Constitution of the United States:

The Congress shall have the power to promote the progress of science and useful arts by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries.

This provision has served America well, leading to general prosperity, national security, and also to the decent living of average people.

This is compared to the anxieties and the horror stories that the common man was living in, which prevailed in the days when our Constitution was written. Throughout the world, ordinary people lived in poverty, and they lived under repression and in a constant state of oppression. What broke this cycle of repression and deprivation and what built a great country here in the United States—an example to the world—was freedom and technology, yes, and guaranteed freedom and technology through the rule of law through our Constitution.

The Americans worked hard to build this great country, yes, but that is not what made the difference. That is not what made us a great country, of how we broke out of that cycle of repression that mankind suffered under for so long. What made the difference was that technology multiplied the results of the hard work of our people. People have been working hard since ancient times. People still work hard today all over the world. The difference is that Americans brought technology to bear on these problems, multiplying the creation of wealth and, thus, the uplifting of ordinary people.

It was our strong patent system that ensured that technology and freedom would work its magic. We can see now that we have had the strongest and the best patent system throughout our country's history, and it has been heralded throughout the world. Yet, today, multinational corporations, some of them run by Americans—and some wonder, when the Americans are running these companies, whose allegiance they have—want to diminish the patent protection of the American people.

In my 25 years, battles have been fought over and over again, often turned back sometimes through compromise, but these efforts over these last 25 years have been aimed at dramatically weakening our patent system. So, basically, the argument has been made over and over again that we need to harmonize America's patent system with the rest of the world's. We have the strongest patent system in the world. We have rights that are guaranteed. Our other rights to speech and prayer, we would never think about harmonizing those with the rest of the world's—we would want to have the strongest constitutional protec-

tions—but now these big companies want to weaken the protection of the intellectual property of our own Americans by harmonizing our law with the weaker laws in Japan and Europe. I say, if they want to harmonize laws, they should be demanding that those other countries strengthen their laws so that the individuals in those countries are protected as Americans have been.

How did that play specifically in terms of demands to change the law, demands which we have managed to thwart over these last 25 years?

Basically, in Europe and Japan, if someone applies for a patent, after 18 months, that patent is published even if that patent has not been granted, meaning the application that the inventor has given out to show his genius is disclosed to everybody in the world. They wanted to do that to the American inventor. If you filed your patent, after 18 months, even if you hadn't received your patent, they were going to publish it. Talk about an invitation to steal. We beat that back, but it was a tough fight. These same people right now are the ones that we are fighting. They are trying to change the patent system in the bill that is going through on Wednesday in the Judiciary Committee.

What do they also want to do? On what else did we have to fight back?

In the United States, as the Constitution says, for 17 years, if someone files for a patent and is granted the patent, no matter how long it takes, you are going to have 17 years in which you own that new idea, that new concept. Guess what? Overseas, that is not the way it is. The minute you file overseas—let's say it takes 15 years for you to get your patent because it is very complicated, and it deals by its very nature with new science and new ideas—guess what? The clock starts ticking immediately when you file for the patent. Sometimes people will have all of their patents' time eaten up by the bureaucracy, which, of course, gives these major corporations in Europe the edge of influencing the bureaucracy when they are going to want to approve or to disapprove of a new innovation, a new piece of technology, for which someone is asking for a patent. Thus, these big corporations are able to force small inventors into deals for their creations, saying that we can fence you in, and you won't ever be able to use it anyway.

We won most of these fights, and the two I just mentioned. Trying to make sure that a patent application that hasn't been granted won't be published, we beat that back. We beat back the idea that the clock is going to start ticking right away so that, if it takes a long time for a patent to be issued, the inventor won't lose all of his rights. We won most of those, and there were some compromises, but this fight never ends with these big companies, with these globalists who have a global sense of the economy, a global

sense of freedom, a global sense of the American people in that we are not so unique and that we are just part of the global system. They keep coming back and coming back.

As for the multinational corporations which have sought to remove these other things that I was mentioning a while ago and to put those in place, they now have another offensive on the way, and I find myself fighting for the small inventors, who are struggling to defend their patent rights, and for the patent rights of all Americans and America's innovators. Of course, we don't see these big corporations presenting an idea to Congress, saying we want to lessen the patent protection of ordinary Americans. No. Instead, they always have to come up with a very sinister-sounding word. Then they hire the best PR people in the world to promote this image in the public's mind.

Before that sinister force that we had to diminish our patent protection for—that we had to make sure that our own inventors could have their patent applications published after 18 months or have the clock ticking away so they would never have a right to enforce their patents—that sinister portion in those days was called a “submarine patent.” It was described in these sinister, derogatory terms, and, boy, they almost succeeded, but we beat them back in their attempt to use a scare tactic to get the American people to fundamentally change our patent system, which has worked so well for us and has affected the standard of living of ordinary Americans.

Now there is another term that is being used. It is even more sinister sounding. I wonder what PR firm was paid how many hundreds of thousands of dollars to come up with it and then millions of dollars to promote this sinister phrase so that people would accept it. The term is “patent troll.” Yes, “patent troll.” There is a good, sinister term. There are patent trolls out there; thus, we have got to change the basics of our patent system in a way that hurts the little guy's ability to protect his own intellectual property rights when it comes to his patent.

These so-called “patent trolls” are patent holders or they are companies which represent patent holders. They are engaged in defending their rights as part of the Constitution—their intellectual property rights—against the infringement of those patents which they own. They are their patents. We are not talking about someone who is stealing a patent from someone. We are not talking about a frivolous suit. We are talking about someone who owns a patent that has been issued to him by the Patent Office. Those patents that they own are just as valid as, perhaps, all of the other patents that are granted by the Patent Office. Yet these huge corporate entities would infringe on the patent rights of the little guy and would give them the middle finger and tell them “sue me if you think you can

get any enforcement of it." No, no, no. These people would have us believe that patent trolls—people who are defending patents that are legitimate patents—are in some way doing something evil.

What makes the patents of these people who are what they call "patent trolls" different than the good patents which are owned by these very same multinational corporations, by these very same corporations who bring very similar litigation forward when their patents are being violated?

The so-called "patent troll" has been identified as being out for profit. This is where they say they are different, that they are out for profit, not from actually seeing technology being used, or that they are out for profit by getting involved in something that he or she did not invent. Surprise, surprise. We have got lawyers who are engaged in litigation only for the fact that they are going to make some money out of the litigation.

Yes, we have frivolous lawsuits, and we should do what we can to stop them in this country, but that doesn't mean that you change the fundamental rights of those people whose rights are being violated. If the small inventor doesn't have the resources to enforce his or her patent, an individual or a company can buy those rights just like it could buy some land from someone who didn't have the resources to plant it or it could commercially try to sell it or to create a partnership.

□ 2130

They can also, or create a partnership.

The small inventor can now go into a partnership or sell his patent rights to someone else. Basically, if they can't enforce their rights because a big company is infringing upon them, they need help. Up until now, they have been legally entitled to get it.

I have consulted with a number of outside individual inventors and groups, and they have reaffirmed that the legislation being proposed in the Judiciary Committee further disadvantages the little guy against the deep-pocketed, multi-national corporations. Many of these multi-national corporations, what they do now is they don't do patent searches when they are utilizing new technology to upgrade the machines and the equipment that they own. They don't do patent searches so that they can just say they didn't know.

Well, in the past, they have taken great pains to make sure they weren't stepping on somebody's toes. Now, if somebody comes to them, they have intentionally not educated themselves to the ownership rights of this individual and they just tell them, well, sue me in court, knowing that most of these people are such little guys they can't enforce their rights.

By the way, this is true of not just patents, but across the board. The little guys in our country need the help of

lawyers who sometimes have to work on contingency or are many times just working on a profit motive to help a little guy against a big guy who has infringed on their rights.

This guise of targeting the so-called "patent trolls," meaning this person or a company who has contracted with the inventor to see that his or her patent rights are respected, that these guys are supposedly horrible. Well, how horrible it is making a business out of helping small inventors or just seeing that an inventor who has not had the ability to commercialize and to enforce his patents, that instead what we have got is people who are out to help that person now enforce the rights that he has under our Constitution, just the same if someone decided not to farm their land. If you own a piece of land and you have decided not to farm it and you want to turn it into some sort of a bird sanctuary, that is your right as long as you own that land. Our Constitution says that people who invent some new ideas have 17 years of ownership, property ownership, on their idea. Now they are trying to stop that; they are trying to change that.

Proponents of this legislation that will go through the Judiciary Committee on Wednesday are covering up the fact that what we are dealing with here is someone who has stolen someone else's patent rights, and now they want to change the system so they can get away with that theft. That is the primary purpose behind this legislation. Now, they will say, oh, we just don't want these big companies, these multi-nationals, to be taken advantage of by someone who owns a patent, a lawful patent, and now is trying to enforce it after not having enforced it for a long period of time.

Well, I would hope that all people will try their best to get their patent on the market and to do good things with these new technologies. In fact, 95 percent of the people I know who are inventors struggle their hardest to get their patent sold and into the commercial market and being put to use because they know other inventions are coming along that are going to take their place. So this is a very small issue, if it is one at all. But the fact is the market is coping with this, is encouraging people who own patents to put them in play. Let the marketplace, let our companies utilize those patents, because they will make a profit out of it.

Tonight, I draw attention of the American people and my colleagues to H.R. 3309, the Innovation Act they call it this time, introduced by Chairman GOODLATTE with 14 bipartisan cosponsors. This bill is scheduled, as I said, to be marked up in the House Judiciary Committee this week even though the committee has only held one hearing on this bill since the introduction of the bill, and that hearing was only 10 legislative days ago.

There are major other forces besides these multi-national corporations that

are at play here, whether we are talking about hospitals and doctors or whether we are talking about other groups in our society like universities and others who own patents. There are a lot of people who are going to lose if this goes through, and they need time to communicate with their representatives. Instead, they are ramrodding this through very quickly.

The witnesses at the hearing that they did have included former Patent Office Director Kappos, who made it clear that we should move slowly and with very great care in making such great changes to the patent law, especially in light of the fact that no one yet understands the implications of the last patent law they passed during the last Congress called the America Invents Act, the AIA. That was Congress' last patent bill, which is right now in the process of being implemented and interpreted by the Patent Office and by the courts.

So we haven't even digested the last bite that Congress has taken out of the patent law apple, and now they want to gobble down a few more bites. In and of itself, this legislation is too broad, its implications are too unclear, and its effects are unknowable. That is what is going to happen. They are going to put that bill right through the process starting on Wednesday at the Judiciary Committee. That is what witnesses and other experts have indicated to us. The conclusion: move forward with caution. But that is not what is happening.

Congress is being railroaded to pass this legislation on top of the last legislation. Well, what is going on here? The congressional ramrodding exemplifies the battle to diminish America's patent system that has been going on for 25 years, the same globalist multinational corporations who may or may not have had interest of the American people at heart.

According to the sponsors of H.R. 3309, it is an attempt to combat the problem of patent trolls. Oh, my gosh, be afraid of patent trolls and weaken the rights of our patent holders, even though a study that was mandated by Congress in the last patent bill that passed just a couple years ago, that study hasn't even been consulted and been made part of this debate. That study showed that this "problem" supposedly that we have, this patent troll thing that has come up now is not really a major driver of lawsuits.

A study that was commissioned by the last patent bill has decided it is not—not—a major driver of lawsuits and has not caused a surge of new lawsuits. Most of the provisions in the legislation that they will pass through the committee this week will make it much more complicated, much more costly, and much more challenging to bring a lawsuit for patent infringement rather than making it simpler, cheaper, and easier to defend against baseless accusations of infringement.

We are being told that these people who are leading the trolls have some

sort of an unjustified claim, that these are false patents, these things shouldn't be enforced. But they haven't done that. What they are doing is preventing people who have regular claims, people who have legitimate claims, from seeking damages from big companies, big guys, who intentionally are infringing upon them.

We are being asked to raise the bar for the inventor to bring a lawsuit to defend his or her rights. We are making it more difficult for the inventor, rather than easier for these big companies to brush away frivolous lawsuits. We instead are making it harder on inventors to defend their legitimate property rights. So rather than lowering the bar to allow small business to defend itself against frivolous lawsuits, we are basically raising the bar when it comes to inventors to protect their rights.

In addition, under the claim of "technical correction," this legislation proposes to remove the patent system's only independent judicial process. That is in section 45 of title 35. If this passes, inventors who are not satisfied that the Patent Office has actually treated them fairly, that the bureaucracy has worked within the law, that they have not been cheated, there is not some collusion going on, the fact is there will be no recourse to an inventor who feels that he has been wronged by our own bureaucracy.

Although this safeguard that we have had that prevents the bureaucracy from doing things that are illegal or out of procedure or violating someone's rights, those safeguards of having a judicial review have been part of our American law system since 1836. It isn't some antiquated process; it is independent judicial review. Last year, the Supreme Court of the United States in *Kappos v. Hyatt* reaffirmed the importance of this provision.

Now the Patent Office has been requested that judicial review be done away with because it is so burdensome—so burdensome—to have a judicial review in case some people within our bureaucracy are acting illegally or incompetently. Oh, we can't allow that because it is too burdensome for the bureaucracy to defend their actions in a courtroom even though this happens on very rare occasions, very rare occasions because we have that recourse. Take away that recourse and those problems will be a lot more. They will grow because there will be nothing to stop them from wrong action in the bureaucracy. The Patent Office wants to strip away the rights of Americans because it is inconvenient to their bureaucracy.

The legislation going before the Judiciary Committee here in the House this week is consistent with the decades-long battle being waged on America's independent inventors by multinational corporations. Here are a few of the provisions:

Might I ask the Chair how much more time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. The Innovation Act will create more paperwork when the inventor files for an infringement claim, thus increasing the cost to defend their rights and a potential for having the case dismissed on a technicality is greatly expanded.

The Innovation Act will switch us to a "loser pays" system, which means the little guy is going to fight some future corporation who has got lawyers on their payroll. That little guy now has to realize he is going to pay enormous costs where the, of course, big corporation only has to pay the legal fees. If you have loser pays, that is what that provision is all about. The big corporation will only have to pay for that little guy. The little guy will have to pay huge expenses and thus, what is it, he is deterred from protecting his own rights. Let's just say loser pays is a loser for the little guy and a big winner for the big guy.

This is so broad they are expanding now who will have to pay with the loser pays. This bill actually brings in people who will now be expected to pay the expenses of these big corporations who are infringing. If that guy loses, if the little guy loses, anybody who has even helped the little guy will be brought in and they will be libel for the loser pays provisions. What does that mean? That means little guys will never be able to get outside help from people to invest in their suit. Philo Farnsworth, the inventor of the picture tube, had to get people to help him because RCA was ripping him off and he had people invest to help pay for his legal fees. This bill would eliminate that by making all of those people libel.

Section 4 of this new bill, the Innovation Act, would create new requirements that a patent holder must meet, once filing a claim of infringement, by providing information about all parties. When he files for an infringement, he has to give information of all the parties, including those people who may have invested in his suit. Thus, we have a blanket. Now we have people exposed to all sorts of harassment. Just for what? For backing up someone's right and saying, I will give you some money to defend your rights.

There is no reason for us to have this type of exposure that has never been required before. This will, again, put great pressure on people not to get involved to help those people whose patents are being infringed upon.

□ 2145

There is a provision in the bill that actually limits the amount of time and things that can be required in discovery, which means the little guy will now have to have many motions of discovery, and every motion will cost him money, rather than having one motion. These things are very complicated and very hard to understand for the American people, but what they add up to,

they have been thought out very well because the big companies know how to beat the little guys down, and that is what this bill is all about.

If we were instead trying to eliminate frivolous lawsuits, which we should, there would be a whole different approach to this. This would be enabling those large companies to defeat frivolous lawsuits. Instead, what we have going through our Judiciary Committee is a bill that makes it harder for those people who are the innovators and the inventors to defend their intellectual property rights.

I would ask my fellow colleagues to join me in opposing this bill. And I ask the American people to pay attention to what is going on and make sure that this attempt to, again, diminish the patent rights of the American people is defeated and, again, that the rights of our people to live in prosperity and to have national security based on our great innovation is protected from multinational corporations who are motivated simply by greed and not for the benefit of the people of the United States.

I yield back the balance of my time.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CONAWAY (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of attending a funeral.

Mr. CULBERSON (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of illness.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of business in the district.

#### SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1471. An act to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of the Army to reconsider decisions to inter or honor the memory of a person in a national cemetery, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, in addition to the Committee on Armed Services for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, November 19, 2013, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3685. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter regarding recommendations to the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3686. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

3687. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Energy, transmitting a report on The Availability and Price of Petroleum and Petroleum Products Produced in Countries Other Than Iran; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3688. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Montana; Revisions to the Administrative Rules of Montana — Air Quality, Subchapter 7, Subchapter 16 and Subchapter 17 [EPA-R08-OAR-2012-0846; FRL-9817-4] received November 13, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3689. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Ohio; Ohio NOx SIP Call Rule Revisions [EPA-R05-OAR-2010-0997; FRL-9901-38-Region 5] received November 13, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3690. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Ohio; Ohio SO<sub>2</sub> Air Quality Rule Revisions [EPA-R05-OAR-2011-0672; FRL-9902-03-Region 5] received November 13, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3691. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Florida; Approval of Revision to the State Implementation Plan [EPA-R04-OAR-2012-0385; FRL-9902-98-Region 4] received November 13, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3692. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Mississippi; Transportation Conformity SIP — Memorandum of Agreement [EPA-R04-OAR-2013-0228; FRL-9902-58-Region 4] received November 13, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3693. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Control of Air Pollution by Permits for New Construction or Modification; Permits for Specific Designated Facilities [EPA-R06-OAR-2006-0593; FRL-9903-00-Region 6] received November 13, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3694. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Tebuconazole; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0427; FRL-9392-1] received November 13, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3695. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Removal of the Regulation for the National Low Emission Vehicle Program [EPA-R03-OAR-2013-0407; FRL-9902-53-Region 3] received November 6, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3696. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Tennessee; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 Lead National Ambient Air Quality Standards; Correction [EPA-R04-OAR-2012-0582; FRL-9902-65-Region 4] received November 6, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3697. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Procedures for Stringency Determinations and Minor Permit Revisions for Federal Operating Permits [EPA-R06-OAR-2010-0355; FRL-9902-50-Region 6] received November 6, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3698. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Boscalid; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0710; FRL-9401-5] received November 6, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3699. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — FD & C Green No. 3; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2013-0003; FRL-9402-7] received November 6, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3700. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Prothioconazole; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0876; FRL-9400-4] received November 6, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3701. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 13-59, Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer and Acceptance, pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3702. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report concerning methods employed by the Government of Cuba to comply with the United States-Cuba September 1994 "Joint Communiqué" and the treatment by the Government of Cuba of persons returned to Cuba in accordance with the United States-Cuba May 1995 "Joint Statement", together known as the Migration Accords; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3703. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 3(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, certification regarding the proposed transfer of major defense equipment (Transmittal No. RSAT-13-3485); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3704. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-116, pursuant to the reporting re-

quirements of Section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3705. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-153, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3706. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-157, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3707. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-126, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3708. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-135, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3709. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-119, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3710. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-075, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3711. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-144, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3712. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-0104, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3713. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-090, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3714. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-175, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 40(g)(2) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3715. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-160, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 40(g)(2) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3716. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-152, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 40(g)(2) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3717. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-161, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 40(g)(2) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3718. A letter from the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction,



transmitting the twenty-first quarterly report on the Afghanistan Reconstruction; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3719. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Mississippi Regulatory Program [SATS No. MS-023-FOR; Docket No.: OSM-2012-0018; S1D1SSS08011000SX066A00067F134S180110; S2D2SSS08011000SX066A00003 F13XS501520] received October 23, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3720. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Commercial Atlantic Aggregated Large Coastal Shark (LCS), Atlantic Hammerhead Shark, Atlantic Blacknose Shark, and Atlantic Non-Blacknose Small Coastal Shark (SCS) Management Groups [Docket No.: 120706221-2705-02] (RIN: 0648-XC881) received October 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3721. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Tax Credits for Sections 25C and 25D [Notice 2013-70] received November 4, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3722. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Update of Weighted Average Interest Rates, Yield Curves, and Segment Rates [Notice 2013-66] received November 4, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3723. A letter from the Assistant Director, Legal Processing Division, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Credit for Production from Advanced Nuclear Facilities [Notice 2013-68] received November 4, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3724. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — 2014 Cost-of-Living Adjustments to the Internal Revenue Code Tax Tables and Other Items [Notice 2013-35] received November 4, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3725. A letter from the Assistant Director for Legislative Affairs, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, transmitting the Annual Report of the Student Loan Ombudsman; jointly to the Committees on Financial Services and Energy and Commerce.

3726. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medicare Program; Conditions of Participation (CoPs) for Community Mental Health Centers [CMS-3202-F] (RIN: 0938-AP51) received October 29, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 1900. A bill to provide for the timely consideration of all licenses, permits, and approvals required under Federal law with respect to the siting, construction,

expansion, or operation of any natural gas pipeline projects; with an amendment (Rept. 113-269). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ISSA: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 2061. A bill to expand the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 to increase accountability and transparency in Federal spending, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113-270). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 419. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1965) to streamline and ensure onshore energy permitting, provide for onshore leasing certainty, and give certainty to oil shale development for American energy security, economic development, and job creation, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2728) to recognize States' authority to regulate oil and gas operations and promote American energy security, development, and job creation (Rept. 113-271). Referred to the House Calendar.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER:

H.R. 3519. A bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to make the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection an independent agency; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 3520. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform rules relating to 501(c)(4) organizations and provide certain taxpayer protections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 3521. A bill to authorize Department of Veterans Affairs major medical facility leases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CASSIDY:

H.R. 3522. A bill to authorize health insurance issuers to continue to offer for sale current group health insurance coverage in satisfaction of the minimum essential health insurance coverage requirement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KINGSTON:

H.R. 3523. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for audits of the Internal Revenue Service to ensure that employees and service contractors of the Internal Revenue Service file their Federal tax returns on time and pay Federal tax debts owed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself and Mr. SCHNEIDER):

H.R. 3524. A bill to amend the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 to provide grants to States for on-the-job training programs for adults in economically disadvantaged areas; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 3525. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to provide assistance for the treatment of hydrocephalus in children in developing countries, to train surgeons and other medical practitioners in innova-

tive methods to treat and cure hydrocephalus, to fund related research, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 3526. A bill to permit persons subject to the jurisdiction of the United States to enter into transactions with certain sanctioned foreign persons that are customary, necessary, and incidental to the donation or provision of goods or services to prevent or alleviate the suffering of civilian populations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TERRY (for himself, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. ROSKAM, and Mr. KING of Iowa):

H.R. 3527. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the poison center national toll-free number, national media campaign, and grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WHITFIELD (for himself and Mr. PALLONE):

H.R. 3528. A bill to amend and reauthorize the controlled substance monitoring program under section 3990 of the Public Health Service Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PITTS (for himself, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. WOLF, Mr. SIREN, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. MORAN, Mr. HUELSEKAMP, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. POLIS):

H. Res. 417. A resolution praising India's rich religious diversity and commitment to tolerance and equality, and reaffirming the need to protect the rights and freedoms of religious minorities; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself, Mr. PITTS, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H. Res. 418. A resolution urging the Government of Burma to end the persecution of the Rohingya people and respect internationally recognized human rights for all ethnic and religious minority groups within Burma; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution:

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER:

H.R. 3519.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7—No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 3520.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

## Article I

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 3521.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CASSIDY:

H.R. 3522.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KINGSTON:

H.R. 3523.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power \* \* \* To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 3524.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have power to enact this legislation to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 3525.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 3526.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 10

By Mr. TERRY:

H.R. 3527.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. WHITFIELD:

H.R. 3528.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 3 that grants Congress the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes;

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 50: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 351: Mr. SALMON and Mrs. LUMMIS.

H.R. 385: Mr. TURNER and Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 494: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 495: Ms. FOXX.

H.R. 647: Mr. ROYCE, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 664: Mr. SCHIFF and Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 669: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 713: Mr. NADLER, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 721: Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 794: Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 798: Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 820: Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 855: Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 915: Mr. HORSFORD.

H.R. 920: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia and Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 942: Ms. ESTY and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 984: Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 1012: Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 1024: Ms. KELLY of Illinois and Mrs. WALORSKI.

H.R. 1098: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 1105: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1180: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. TITUS, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. HORSFORD, and Ms. CLARKE.

H.R. 1209: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 1241: Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 1250: Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 1337: Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

H.R. 1339: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. HORSFORD.

H.R. 1429: Mr. LATHAM and Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 1501: Ms. MENG and Mr. HORSFORD.

H.R. 1563: Mr. BUCHSON.

H.R. 1603: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 1629: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1666: Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 1678: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 1725: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. PETERS of California, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 1726: Mr. NUGENT, Mr. VELA, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. BARTON, Mrs. BLACK, and Mr. BUCHANAN.

H.R. 1732: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 1750: Mrs. BACHMANN, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. DAINES, Mr. POSEY, Ms. GRANGER, and Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 1755: Mr. ENYART, Mr. SABLAN, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 1779: Mr. BARROW of Georgia.

H.R. 1787: Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. HUELSKAMP, and Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 1795: Mr. O'ROURKE and Mr. HALL.

H.R. 1869: Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 1905: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 1943: Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 1951: Mr. WOLF.

H.R. 1992: Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 2001: Mr. WELCH, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 2061: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 2084: Mr. HORSFORD.

H.R. 2103: Mr. RUNYAN.

H.R. 2118: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 2214: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 2237: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 2328: Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 2426: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 2430: Mr. WATT.

H.R. 2459: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 2482: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 2499: Mr. PETERS of Michigan and Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 2502: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. TIERNEY, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. KIND, and Ms. SCHWARTZ.

H.R. 2509: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 2520: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 2591: Mr. VEASEY, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, and Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 2662: Ms. NORTON and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 2663: Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 2670: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 2717: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.

H.R. 2737: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 2778: Mr. LONG.

H.R. 2824: Mr. DAINES.

H.R. 2887: Mr. BEATTY.

H.R. 2902: Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. PALLONE, and Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 2918: Mr. BACHUS and Mr. WENSTRUP.

H.R. 2939: Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. WOLF, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 2959: Mr. WOMACK, Mr. COLE, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. LATTA, Mr. HANNA, Mr. MARCHANT, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. SCHOCK, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, and Mr. LABRADOR.

H.R. 3005: Mr. PETERS of California.

H.R. 3024: Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 3030: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.

H.R. 3040: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 3084: Mr. PETERS of California.

H.R. 3111: Mr. ROSS, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, and Mr. GRIMM.

H.R. 3113: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 3121: Mr. HENSARLING and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 3135: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 3150: Mr. HIGGINS.

H.R. 3168: Mr. CONAWAY.

H.R. 3172: Ms. CHU, Mr. TONKO, Mr. COHEN, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 3179: Mr. SCALISE and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 3212: Mr. TIPTON and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 3240: Mr. VEASEY, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. ROSS, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 3323: Mr. WOLF.

H.R. 3353: Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 3357: Ms. WILSON of Florida and Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 3360: Mr. TAKANO and Ms. DUCKWORTH.

H.R. 3364: Mr. PITTS and Mr. COLE.

H.R. 3369: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 3370: Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 3377: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H.R. 3391: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.

H.R. 3410: Mr. KLINE, Mr. YODER, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. STEWART, and Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 3413: Mr. FINCHER, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. WHITFIELD, and Mr. BARROW of Georgia.

H.R. 3439: Mr. FARR and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 3449: Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 3453: Ms. TITUS, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 3466: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 3467: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 3468: Mr. PETERS of Michigan.

H.R. 3484: Mr. WAXMAN and Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 3485: Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. GARDNER, and Mr. MCCAUL.

H.R. 3489: Mr. MCKINLEY.

H.R. 3510: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 3511: Mr. MEEKS.

H. Res. 72: Mrs. BEATTY.

H. Res. 123: Mr. COHEN.

H. Res. 147: Mr. POE of Texas and Mrs. BACHMANN.

H. Res. 188: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H. Res. 326: Mr. NUNNELEE.

H. Res. 356: Mr. LAMALFA.

H. Res. 394: Mr. POE of Texas.

H. Res. 401: Mr. HIMES, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Ms. SCHWARTZ.

H. Res. 404: Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. Frankel of Florida, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MENG, Mr. MESSER, Mr. RADEL, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. PERRY.

H. Res. 408: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. WATERS, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. POCAN, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. ENYART, and Mr. FARR.

H. Res. 411: Mr. PEARCE.

H. Res. 412: Mr. MULLIN, Mr. BARR, Mr. VEASEY, and Mr. O'ROURKE.

## CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Representative HOLT, or a designee, to H.R. 2728, the Protecting States' Rights to Promote American Energy Security Act, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MRS. MILLER OF MICHIGAN

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on House Administration in H.R. 3487, to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act to extend through 2018 the authority of the Federal Election Campaign Commission to impose civil money penalties

on the basis of a schedule of penalties established and published by the Commission, to expand such authority to certain other violations, for other purposes, do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.